THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR HYMENOMYCETES—IV

Boletaceae

M. A. DONK

Reprinted from

REINWARDTIA

Published by Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia

Volume 3, Part 2, pp. 275 - 313 (1955)

Printed by ARCHIPEL, Bogor, Java

COMMONWEALTH MYCOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
10 SEP 1956

REINWARDTIA
Published by Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia
Volume 3, Part 2, pp. 275 - 313 (1955)

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR HYMENOMYCETES—IV*

Boletaceae

M. A. DONK**

SUMMARY

1. This fourth part deals with the family of Boletaceae as currently delimited, with the exclusion of the frankly lamellate groups.
2. The commonly accepted typification of *Boletus* Fr. by *B. edulis* Bull. ex Fr. is not that which would be arrived at by strict adherence to the recommendations for the selection of types. It is, however, desirable to find a way of accepting *B. edulis* as the type species of *Boletus*.
3. The correct name for the genus generally called *Gyrodon* Opat. seems to be *Uloporus* Quél.
4. The proposal to conserve *Xerocomus* Quél. against *Versipelles* Quél. is repeated.

INTRODUCTION.—This paper forms the fourth part of a series planned to give an annotated nomenclatorial enumeration of all generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes. For some general remarks on the series and the explanation of some nomenclatorial terms the reader is referred to Part I (Donk *in* Reinwardtia 1: 199-203. 1951). I am very much indebted to Dr. R. W. G. Dennis, The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, for linguistic improvements and other help.

DEFINITION.—Boletaceae (or Boletales) as understood in the present paper is the family currently so called, with the exception of some frankly lamellate genera that will be dealt with together with the agarics. This is not done because these genera are taxonomically excluded, but merely because all lamellate genera will be treated together. Those genera which are undoubtedly related to certain typical agaric genera, but have a porose hymenophore (*Filoboletus* P. Henn., etc.), will also be included in the "Agaricaceae." Finally, some genera that might be looked for here, but are now invariably referred to other families (*Boletopsis* Fayod. *Albatrellus* S. F. Gray) will find a place in the "Polyporaceae."

* Part I ("Cyphellaceae") of this series was published *in* Reinwardtia 1: 199-220. 1951; Part II (Hymenolichenes), *in* Reinwardtia 2: 435-440. 1954; Part III ("Clavariaceae"), *in* Reinwardtia 2: 441-493. 1954.

** Kebun Raya Indonesia.

ALPHABETICAL ENUMERATION

Aerocomus.—See *Xerocomus*.

Albatrellus S. F. Gray.—See "Polyporaceae."

Anastomaria Rafin, Ann. Nat. ou Ann. Synop. 16. 1820 (devalidated name). — Type species (by original designation): *Anastomaria campanulata* Rafin. — In connection with the first of the two original species, the author stated, "This may be the type of the genus," and with the second, "It may be the type of a subgenus *Campsilicus*." Rafinesque's descriptions of the genus and the type species run as follows:

Anastomaria Rafin.—"Fructifications in flexuose lamellar veins; anastomosed like a net. — The genus will be next to *Merulius* and *Dedalea*; some species of them may probably belong to it."

Anastomaria campanulata Rafin.—"Stipulated fulvous; stipe thick; peride campanulated; netted outside, margin erose, insides scaly and dark spotted. . . . Size four or five inches. It grows in the State of New York."

This genus and its two species were discussed by Leman (*in* Dict. Sci. nat. 30: 179. 1824) at the end of his treatment of *Merulius* [Haller]: "Dans l'*Anastomaria* les nervures sont lamelliformes, anastomosées en manière de réseau. Ce caractère ne nous semble pas suffisant pour séparer ce genre du *Cantharellus*, avec lequel il nous paroit devoir être confondu." The genus not being definitely admitted, this treatment does not constitute the valid publication of the name after the starting-point date. It is difficult to form an opinion about the identity of *A. campanulata* from the too incomplete description. I enter *Anastomaria* here because one is reminded, for instance, of *Boletinellus merulioides* (Schw.) Murrill or *Phylloporus rhodoxanthus* (Schw.) Bres., rather than of the "Polyporaceae" (including *Merulius* Fr.).

Bactroboletus Clem.—See "Agaricaceae."

Boletellus Murrill *in* Mycologia 1: 9. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Boletus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Boletus ananas* Curt.—This species is sometimes identified with the earlier described *Boletus coccinus* Fr.; Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 125-126. 1945) accepted this identity only with doubt. — TYPONYM: *Strobilofungus* Lloyd (1912; not validly published).

Boletinellus Murrill *in* Mycologia 1: 7. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Boletinus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): "*Boletinus porosus* Peck" = *Paxillus porosus* Berk. apud Lea.—Murrill

(*l.c.*) and subsequent American authors have identified this species with *Daedalea merulioides* Schw. = *Boletinellus merulioides* (Schw.) Murrill. — SCOPE. Introduced with three species.

Boletinus Kalchbr. *in* Bot. Ztg 25: 182. 1867. —ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Boletus*. Gender: m.— TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus cavipes* Opat. — REMARKS. Often "Kalchbr., Ic. sel. Hym. Hung. Fasc. 4: 52 *pl. 31.* 1877" is cited as the place of publication of this generic name. — Kalchbrenner (*l.c.*, 1867) stated that before the name *Boletinus* was definitely published he had used both it and *Tramaporus* as manuscript names in correspondence. — TYPONYM: *Euryporus* Quél. (1886).

Boletium Clem., Gen. Fungi 108. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: apparently irregularly formed diminutive of *βωλίτης* or boletus, both ancient fungus names. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Boletus volvatus* Pers.—For this fungus, see under *Volvoboletus*. — BASINYM: *Volvoboletus* P. Henn. (1898), q.v. — REMARK. A superfluous isonym.

Boletochaete Sing. *in* Mycologia 36: 358. 1944. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Boletus*; *χαίτη*, hair. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Boletus spinifer* Pat. & C. F. Baker. — SCOPE. Introduced for two species.

Boletogaster Lohwag *in* Beih. bot. Cbl. 42II: 274. 1926; *in* Handel-Mazzetti, Symb. sinicae 2 (Keissl. & Lohwag, Fungi): 55. 1937. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Boletus*; *γαστήρ*, belly. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Ceriomyces jalapensis* Murrill sensu Lohwag.—Lohwag's identification of his fungus is still to be confirmed; compare Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 135. 1945). — REMARK. It is somewhat doubtful whether there is a valid generic (rather than a specific) description accompanying the publication of the name in 1926; in the publication of 1937 a Latin generic description was given.

Boletopsis Fayod.—See "Polyporaceae."

Boletopsis P. Henn. *in* Engl. & Pr., Nat. PflFam. 1 (1**): 194. 1898. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Boletus*; *ὄψις*, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus luteus* L. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for the ringed species of *Boletus* L. ex Fr. *sensu lato;* thirteen species were mentioned and arranged in three groups: section 1, "*Versipelles*," [1] with two

[1] No author was given, but there is no doubt that this epithet should have been cited as originating from Fries (cf. Hym. europ. 514. 1874), whose *Boletus* sect. *Versipelles* Fr. includes *B. rufus* as a synonym of *Boletus versipellis*.

species (*Boletus rufus* "Schaeff.," first species, and *Boletopsis staudtii* P. Henn.) ; section 2, "*Cricunopus* Karst.," with ten species (*Boletus luteus, B. flavus* With. ex Fr., *B. flavidus* Fr., etc.) ; section 3, "*Boletinus* Kalchbr.," with one species [*Boletinus cavipes* (Opat.) Kalchbr.]. — TYPIFICATION. Three species, *Boletus rufus, B. luteus,* and *Boletinus cavipes,* the type species of the names of the three sections into which the genus was divided, are to be considered as the most eligible ones; for two of these, see under *Cricunopus* P. Karst. and *Boletinus* Kalchbr. When subsequently Smotlacha [*in* S.B. böhm. Ges. Wiss., Math.-nat. Cl. **1911** (8) : 32. 1912] applied the name *Boletopsis* P. Henn. in a somewhat restricted circumscription, he excluded Hennings's first section, *'Versipelles,'* which became *Boletus* subgen. *Krombholzia* (P. Karst.) Smotlacha. Beck von Mannagetta (*in* Z. Pilzk. 2 : 147. 1923), too, emended *Boletopsis* with the exclusion of the same group; he contested the presence of a ring in *Boletus rufus* (*op. cit.* p. 144, footnote). Thus *Boletus rufus* drops out. It seems best to select *Boletus luteus* as the type species of *Boletopsis,* because it represents the largest group included in that genus. It was already selected by Singer (*in* Lilloa **22**: 654. 1951). — Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 5. 1909), for some reason not clear to me, enumerated *Boletopsis* P. Henn. as a "metonym" of *Boletinus* Kalchbr.; it is not apparent what species he considered the type. — Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 346. 1931) suggested *Boletus rufus.* This choice should be rejected on historical grounds (see above). Moreover, it is not a species answering well to the chief characteristic of the genus: "Hut anfangs mit dem Stiele durch einen Schleier verbunden," although Hennings, the author of *Boletopsis,* stated that it possessed such a veil (exceeding margin). A well developed veil is typical of the second and third section and its existance expressed in the name *Cricunopus,* based on *Boletus luteus!* — REMARK. A superfluous name; compare Underwood (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. 25: 630. 1898). — HOMONYM: *Boletopsis* Fayod (1889; "Polyporaceae"). — TYPONYMS: *Suillus* S. F. Gray (1821), *Cricunopus* P. Karst. (1881), *Viscipellis* Quél. (1886), *Peplopus* (Quél.) Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry (1887), and *Ixocomus* Quél. (1888). And compare *Boletus* L. ex Fr. (1821). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Boletus L. *ex* Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 385. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: *βῶλος,* clod, *βωλίτης,* Greek fungus name, or, rather, boletus, Roman fungus name. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected) : *Boletus bovinus* L. ex Fr., but see below, where *B. edulis* Bull. ex Fr. is proposed as substitute type species. — SOME HISTORICAL NOTES. The name *βωλίτης,* or boletus, is an ancient one.

The Romans used it for instance for *Amanita caesarea* (Scop. ex Fr.) Schw. and perhaps others mushrooms were also indicated by that name. — *Boletus* Tourn., Elem. Bot. 1: 440. 1694; Inst. 1: 561. 1700.—De Tournefort designated by this name a varied assemblage of fungi, comprising species of *Morchella* [Dill.] Fr., *Clathrus* Pers., and *Phallus* Pers. His French name for the genus is "Morille" and species of the *Morchella* element were listed first by him. We may confidently reduce *Boletus* Tourn. to the synonymy of *Morchella*. — *Boletus* [Tourn.] Adans., Fam. Pl. 2: 9. 1763.—Adanson, who had his own nomenclatural system, continued the Tournefortian tradition. He called the genus "*Boletus*. Tour. *t. 329*" (= Tourn., Inst. 1: 561 *pl. 329*. 1700). The plate referred to represents two species, one belonging to *Morchella* (*f. A*) and one to *Clathrus* (*f. B.*). His generic description in combination with other considerations allow us to list *Boletus* [Tourn.] Adans., too, as a synonym of *Morchella*. Compare also *Boletus* "Micheli" of Von Haller (Hist. Stirp. indig. Helv. inch. 2: 133. 1768). — *Boletus* [Tourn.] Juss., Gen. Pl. 4. 1789.—Both Adanson and Von Haller alike rejected Linnaeus's arbitrary usage of old established names. The first author to introduce *Boletus* in continuation of the Tournefortian tradition in the binomial system was De Jussieu. He restricted *Boletus* to *Morchella*. This is one of the instances in which he resisted Linnaeus's authority by backing De Tournefort; a similar case is his use of *Amanita* Dill. for *Agaricus* L. — The name *Boletus* has not been used in the sense of *Morchella* in any publication subsequent to 1821. — *Boletus* Dill., Cat. Pl. ca Gissam nasc. 188 & App. 74. 1719.[2]—The forerunner of Linnaeus's genus *Boletus* is this Dillenian use by which the old name *Boletus* was transferred to those fungi we are now calling the boletes (that is, to *Suillus* of Dillenius's contemporaries) and perhaps a few polypores. It is almost impossible to know what precisely the ten species listed by Dillenius represent. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Boletus* [Dill.] L., Spec. Pl. 2: 1176. 1753.—When Linnaeus took up the Dillenian name, he extented its application by also including the polypores. Even in comparatively recent times the Linnean genus is still often ascribed to Dillenius. Linnaeus's first use of the name is in "Systema naturae" (1735; as "*Boletus* D."), which shows that he had already adopted it before the introduction of his binomial method. — SCOPE. When Fries took up Linnaeus's name and genus, he restricted it by excluding the polypores and retaining the boletes. His first species is *Boletus luteus*. He called the genus "*Boletus*. Dill." — TYPIFICATION. Various species have been suggested or indicated. (i) The

[2] "*Boletus luteus* Dill. 1719, der Butterpilz, ist eigentlich der Typus von *Boletus* . . . ."—O. Kuntze [Rev. Gen. Pl. 3 (2): 522. 1898].

first author drastically to restrict *Boletus* "(Tiu)" [!][3] in Fries's circumscription, before any type species had been indicated, was Karsten [*in* Rev. mycol. 3 (No. 9): 17. 1881]: the three (Finnish) species admitted were "*B. bovinus* Linn.," "*B. piperatus* Bull.," and "*B. variegatus* Swartz," in this order. The first of these is a (ringless) species of Linnaeus's (of 1753). The Appendix for the determination of types seems to favour the selection of this fungus, *B. bovinus!* This would make *Boletus* the correct name for the segregate now often called, *Ixocomus* Quél. = *Suillus* S. F. Gray. — (ii) Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 10. 1909; *in* N. Amer Fl. 9: 154. 1910) was perhaps the first author to appoint a type species in the modern direct manner, viz., *Boletus luteus* L. ex Fr., for *Boletus* L. (1753), of which it is the first species. Maire, who contrary to Murrill adopted the later starting-point date for these fungi, made the same species his choice for *Boletus* L. ex Fr., defending it as follows:

"Le genre *Boletus*, tel que l'envisageait Fries dans le *Systema mycologicum*, point de départ de nomenclature des Hyménomycètes, était un démembrement du genre *Boletus* de Linné, qui comprenait les *Polyporus*, les *Boletus* et une partie des *Daedalea* de Fries. La première espèce décrite par Fries dans ces *Boletus* est justement une des espèces de Linné, *B. luteus*, Champignon bien connu et ne pouvant donner lieu à aucune confusion. Elle doit à notre avis, être considerée comme le type du genre de Fries."—Maire [*in* Publ. Inst. Bot., Barcelona 3 (4): 40. 1937].

The acceptance of this (ringed) species would again make *Boletus* the correct name for *Ixocomus* Quél. = *Suillus* S. F. Gray.[4] — (iii) Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 346. 1933) made the surprising suggestion of *Boletus subtomentosus* L., for *Boletus* "(Dill.) L." — (v) W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 14. 1953) listed *Boletus cavipes* Opat. as Opatowski's type species of *Boletus* "Dill. ex Fr." Apparently an error; it merely is Opatowski's first species. — (vi) Several modern authors still use *Boletus* in a wide circumscription, but an ever increasing number admit among a considerable series of smaller genera one with the name *Boletus* and with *Boletus edulis* as the type species: Gilbert, Konrad, Konrad & Maublanc, Snell, Singer, and several more (Maire, as quoted above, being an exeption). "[Le] dé-

[3] The following year Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 37: 9. 1882) wrote "(Dill.)."

[4] Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 21. 1947) thought that he could put aside *B. luteus* because "S. F. Gray [1821] separated the genus *Suillus* with the type species *S. luteus* from the rest of the boletes, and Snell accepted this name." This is not a fair statement of the situation. Gray divided *Boletus* L. (*sensu lato*) into numerous genera, retaining *Boletus* for some of the polypores, and excluded *all* of the boletes, which he distributed over three genera, *Leccinum* S. F. Gray, *Pinuzza* S. F. Gray, and *Suillus* S. F. Gray. In this way he also excluded *B. edulis*, the species accepted by Singer! An other of Singer's untenable conclusions is that one is not bound under any circumstance to accept a lectotype indicated in accordance with the first-species rule of the former American code.

membrement de l'ancien genre Bolet, oblige . . . forcément à conserver un genre *Boletus* résiduel, don't l'espèce type, par raison quelque peu sentimentale, ne peut être que le *B. edulis*."—Gilbert (Bolets 73. 1931). This was also the conclusion of the "Commission de Nomenclature" of the "Société Mycologique de France" (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 66: 76, 77, 81, 104. 1950). A drawback of this selection is that *Boletus edulis* is not among Linnaeus's species, but it figures among Fries's. If this species be preferred to the perhaps technically more correct choice of *B. bovinus*, the generic name as re-published by Fries should become dissociated from Linnaeus's and be cited as '*Boletus* Fr. (not *Boletus* L.)' rather than as '*Boletus* L. ex Fr.' I would heartily support any legal way of arriving at the typification of '*Boletus* Fr.' by *B. edulis*. — MONADELPHOUS HOMONYMS: (i) *Boletus* L. *ex* Hook., Fl. scot. 2: 26. 1821.—This is perhaps the first re-introduction of the broadly conceived Linnean genus (inclusive of the polypores) after the starting-point date. The next authors validly to re-publish the name for the same broadly conceived genus are Mérat (Nouv. Fl. Paris, 2e Ed., 1: 39. 1821) and Roques (Phytogr. médic. 18. 1821), in this order. This generic name must be typified in connection with *Boletus* L. (non Fr.), a puzzle which I do not attempt to solve here. — (ii) *Boletus* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. 1: 640. 1821.—A re-publication of the Linnean name (but ascribed to Dillenius) independently of Fries's and Hooker's and applied exclusive of the boletes, but including only a selection of the polypores. Gray included 17 (British) species. His generic description runs: "Cap sessile, semicircular, attached by the side." Common to Gray's and Linnaeus's genus (of 1753) are, for instance, *Boletus igniarius* L. (*Phellinus* Quél.) and *B. versicolor* L. (*Coriolus* Quél.). A belated example of the application of the first-species rule is the listing of *Boletus caesius* Schrad. as the type species by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 14. 1953). — (iii) Compare also the emendations of *Boletus* L. by Murrill (type species, *Boletus luteus*) and of *Boletus* L. by Karsten (type species, *B. bovinus*[5]), both already mentioned above. If *Boletus edulis* is taken as the type species of *Boletus* 'Fr.' these two applications would become additional monadelphous homonyms; see Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 18: 285, 286. 1949). — HOMONYM: *Boletus* [Tourn.] Adans. (1763; Pezizales; devalidated name), see above. — TYPONYMS. If *Boletus bovinus* is accepted as the type species: none; if *Boletus luteus* is taken: *Suillus* S. F. Gray (1821), *Cricunopus* P. Karst. (1881), *Viscipellis* Quél. (1886), *Peplopus* (Quél.) Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry. (1887), *Ixocomus* Quél. (1888), and *Boletopsis*

[5] Listed as the type species of *Boletus* "Dill. ex Fr. sensu Karst." by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 14. 1953).

P. Henn. (1898); and if *Boletus edulis* will be appointed: *Tubiporus* Paul. ex P. Karst. (1881), *Dictyopus* Quél. (1886), *Oedipus* Bataille (1908), and *Ceriomyces* Murrill (1909; preoccupied); and compare *Suillus* [Haller] O.K. (1898; preoccupied).

Campbellia Cooke & Mass. *apud* Cooke *in* Grevillea 18: 87. 1890. — ETYMOLOGY: Mrs. F. Campbell-Martin. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Merulius infundibuliformis* Cooke & Mass.—A very imperfecty known species which needs to be redescribed from the type collection; the spores suggest *Uloporus* Quél. ('*Gyrodon* Opat.'). — SCOPE. Two species. The one here indicated as the type is the first, *Campbellia africana* Cooke & Mass., the second. The latter is said by Singer (*in* Lilloa 22: 648. 1951) to be certainly *Gyrodon* (= *Uloporus*). — TYPIFICATION. The first species was sent in by the collector who was commemorated in the generic name; labels and documents (coloured figure) in the Kew Herbarium leave no doubt as to this species being the correct choice. It was selected by Murrill (*in* J. Mycol. 9: 98. 1903), Imazeki (*in* Bull. Tokyo Sci Mus. No. 6: 41. 1943), and W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 16. 1953). — Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 347. 1931) suggested *C. africana*; Singer (*in* Schweiz. Z. Pilzk. 29: 217. 1951) selected the same species and, moreover, remarked (Singer *in* Sydowia 5: 466. 1951), in connection with "a specimen at the Riksmuseet [Stockholm] which came from the Herbarium Sydow and is evidently part of the type as it was collected by Wood 1888," that "since it is the first species of this dubious genus available for examination, it is here considered as type of the genus." This argument must be rejected: the types of both species have been available from the start in the Kew Herbarium, and I would add that a study of the specimens used by the authors of the name ought to have precedence. Finally, the indication of *C. africana* as type species is of a much later date than that of *M. infundibuliformis!* — HOMONYM: *Campbellia* Wight (1850; Orobanchaceae). — ISONYM: *Rodwaya* H. & P. Syd. (1901), q.v. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym, and, therefore, renamed.

Ceriomyces Murrill *in* Mycologia 1: 140. 1909; *in* N. Amer. Fl. 9: 136. 1910. — ETYMOLOGY: κηρίον, honeycomb; μύκης, fungus. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): "*Ceriomyces crassus* Batt.," interpreted by Murrill as identical with *Boletus edulis* Bull. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Applied to a part of *Boletus* L. — REMARK. Murrill resurrected an old name and validly published it in so doing in 1909. He (Murrill *in* J. Mycol. 9: 87, 98. 1903) had earlier entered "*Ceriomyces* Batarr." with

"*C. crassus* Batarr." (the first 'binomial' listed) as a genus of Boletaceae, but on that occasion he did not validly publish the name because he added no generic description and his reference to Battarra is worthless since the latter author gave no description that would comply with the present Code. Some general remarks on Battarra's names (which are neither binomial nor binary) will be given in the instalment devoted to "Agaricaceae"; compare also Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 18: 370-371. 1949). *Ceriomyces* Batt. (Fung. Agri arimin. Hist. 62 *pl. 24 f. A.* 1755) is the (monoverbal) specific name for the fruit-bodies of *Polyporus tuberaster* (Jacq.) ex Fr., sprouting from the well-known Italian 'fungus stones'; this species is among the contents of Battarra's class XV. (*Polyporus tuberaster* is the selected type species of *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. ex Fr.) Besides, the word "Ceriomyces" entered into the names of nine species forming together the whole of Battarra's class XVI. The first of these, *Ceriomyces crassus* Batt. (*op. cit. pl. 29 f. A, B*), identified with *Boletus edulis*,[6] was regarded as the nomenclatorial type species by Murrill. If Battarra's 'generic name' is to be typified at all, it should be by the species bearing the specific name *Ceriomyces*, that is, by *Polyporus tuberaster*. However, that species was passed by Murrill because its name was 'non-binomial': "[Battarra's] first binomial species listed is *C. crassus* Battarr. . . . . "—Murrill (*in* J. Mycol. 9: 87. 1903). This latter name is biverbal but not binomial! Since the valid publication of *Ceriomyces* rests on Murrill accompanying description, it should be typified by that author's interpretation of *Ceriomyces crassus*, rather than by Battarra's fungus. — HOMONYM: *Ceriomyces* Corda (1837; "Polyporaceae"), q.v. — TYPONYMS: *Tubiporus* Paul. ex P. Karst. (1881), *Dictyopus* Quél. (1886), and *Oedipus* Bataille (1908). And compare *Boletus* L. ex Fr. (1821) and *Suillus* [Haller] O.K. (1898; preoccupied). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Chalciporus Bataille *in* Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Doubs No. 15: 19 (reprint pagination). 1908. — ETYMOLOGY: *χαλκός*, copper; *πόρος*, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus piperatus* Bull. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Three species were treated in a key, their order being *Boletus pierrhuguesii* Boud., *B. piperatus*, and *B. amarellus* Quél. — TYPIFICATION. The obvious choice is *Boletus piperatus*, already selected by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 19. 1953).

[6] This is apparently Laplanche's determination (Dict. icon. Champ. sup. 371. 1894). Fries (Syst. mycol. 1: 381. 1821) and Persoon (Mycol. europ. 2: 133. 1825) referred Battarra's fungus to "*Boletus luridus*" and "*Boletus luridus* var. *tuberosum*" respectively.

"*Chlorosiphon*,"
"*Heterosarcus*,"
"*Holosiphon*,"
"*Homosarcus*," and
"*Porphyrosporus*" (see also under *Porphyrosporus*).

Kallenbach (*in* Pilze Mitteleurop. 1), who favoured an inclusive genus *Boletus*, often cited in his synonymy specific names the generic appellations of which corresponded to infrageneric epithets.

"*Chlorosiphon badius* (Fr.) Beck v. Mann. 1923" (Kallenbach, *op. cit.* p. 147. ca. 1939) reflects the existence of *Boletus* subsect. *Chlorosiphon* Beck (*in* Z. Pilzk. 2: 144. 1923); "*Heterosarcus appendiculatus* (ex Schaeff.) Bataille 1908" (Kallenbach, *op. cit.* p. 83. ca. 1931), of *Oedipus* subgen. *Heterosarcus* Bataille [*in* Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Doubs No. 15: 14 (reprint pagination). 1908]; "*Holosiphon variegatus* von Beck 1923" (Kallenbach, *op. cit.* p. 49. 1928), of *Boletus* sect. *Holosiphon* Beck (*in* Z. Pilzk. 2: 143. 1923); "*Homosarcus regius* Bat. 1908" (Kallenbach, *op. cit.* p. 25. 1927), of *Oedipus* subgen. *Homosarcus* Bataille [*in* Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Doubs No. 15: 13 (reprint pagination). 1908]; and "*Porphyrosporus* Smotl. 1911" (Kallenbach, *op. cit.* p. 61. 1930), of *Boletus* subgen. *Porphyrosporus* Smotlacha [*in* S.B. böhm. Ges. Wiss., Math.-nat. Cl. 1911 (8): 31. 1911]. And see also under *Gymnopus* Quél. and *Peplopus* Quél.

Coelopus Bataille *in* Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Doubs No. 15: 12 (reprint pagination). 1908 — ETYMOLOGY: κοῖλος, hollow; πούς, foot. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus cyanescens* Bull. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Two species were treated in a key; first species, *Boletus cyanescens*. The other species is *B. castaneus* Bull. — TYPIFICATION. The first species was indicated as the type by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 22. 1953). — TYPONYMS: *Suillus* P. Karst. (1882; preoccupied), *Gyroporus* Quél. (1886), *Lactisuillus* O.K. (1898; not validly published), and *Leucoconius* (Reichenb.) ex Beck (1923).

Cricunopus P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. 3 (No. 9): 16. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: κρίκος, ring; πούς, foot. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus luteus* L. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for the ringed species of *Boletus* sect. *Viscipelles* * *Genuini* Fr. (Hym. europ. 496. 1874), although this name was not especially mentioned. Karsten listed three (Finnish) species of which the first is *Boletus luteus*. — TYPIFICATION. Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 10. 1909) indicated the first species as the type; later authors selected the same species. — TYPONYMS: *Suillus* S. F. Gray (1821), *Viscipellis* Quél. (1886), *Peplopus* (Quél.) Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry (1887), *Ixocomus*

Quél. (1888), and *Boletopsis* P. Henn. (1898; preoccupied). And compare *Boletus* L. ex Fr. (1821).

Dictyopus Quél., Ench. Fung. 159. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: δίκτυον, network; πούς, foot. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus edulis* Bull. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for a part of *Boletus* L. ex Fr. First species, *Boletus felleus* Bull. ex Fr.; second species, *B. edulis*. — TYPIFICATION. The first species, *B. felleus*, was soon afterwards given a special provisional generic name (*Rhodoporus* Quél., q.v.), a name validly published by Bataille in 1908. The indication of this species as the type of *Dictyopus* by Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 15. 1909) is, therefore, to be rejected. There should be no hesitation in selecting *B. edulis;* it is the best known edible bolete included. It was chosen by Konrad (*in* Schweiz. Z. Pilzk. 10: 150. 1932; for *Dictyopus* as a subgeneric epithet), Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 20. 1947, and Kühner (*in* Bull. Soc. Nat. Oyonnax 2: 44. 1948). — TYPONYMS: *Tubiporus* Paul. ex P. Karst. (1881), *Oedipus* Bataille (1908), and *Ceriomyces* Murrill (1909; preoccupied). And compare *Boletus* L. ex Fr. (1821) and *Suillus* [Haller] O.K. (1898; preoccupied).

Eriocorys Quél., Ench. Fung. 163. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: ἔριον, wool; κόρυς, helmet, head. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus strobilaceus* Scop. ex Fr.—The correct name for this species is rather *Strobilomyces floccopus* (Vahl ex Fr.) P. Karst. — REMARK. Though not indicated as such, one might well be tempted to consider this name an isonym of *Strobilomyces* Berk.; however, the latter was not mentioned even as a synoym. In any case *Eriocorys* is a perfectly superfluous name. — TYPONYM: *Strobilomyces* Berk. (1851).

Euriporus.—See *Euryporus*.

Euryporus Quél., Ench. Fung. 163. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: εὐρύς, wide; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus cavipes* Opat. — REMARK. Though not indicated as such, one might well be tempted to consider this name an isonym of *Boletinus* Kalchbr.; however, the latter was not mentioned even as a synonym. In any case *Euryporus* is a perfectly superfluous name. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Euriporus*"; Léon March., Enum. méth. Mycoph. 203. 1896.—Apparently an error. — TYPONYMS: *Boletinus* Kalchbr. (1867) and *Tramaporus* Kalchbr. (1867; not validly published).

Favaria Rafin., Anal. Nat. ou Tabl. Univ. 211. 1815. — A nomen nudum for a genus of "Boletidia," the latter including boletes as well as

polypores. No suggestion is possible as to the group for which it was coined.

Filoboletus P. Henn.—See "Agaricaceae."

Fistulina Bull. ex Fr.—See "Polyporaceae."

Fistulinella P. Henn. *in* Bot. Jb. 30: 43. 1901. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Fistulina*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Fistulinella staudii* P. Henn.

Frostiella Murrill, Florida Bol. *in* Mimeogr. Contr. Herb. Univ. Florida Exp. Sta. [unnumbered]: 1, 6. 1942. — Introduced for two species, *Boletus russellii* Frost and *B. betula* Schw. The first of these was indicated as the type species by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 36. 1953). — Not validly published: no Latin description; there is a short English one in the key on page 1.

Gasteroboletus.—See *Gastroboletus*.

Gastroboletus Lohwag *in* Beih. bot. Cbl. 42II: 273. 1926 (description reproduced by Singer *in* Ann. mycol. 40: 21. 1942); *in* Handel-Mazetti, Symb. sinicae 2 (Keissl. & Lohwag, Fungi): 54. 1937. — ETYMOLOGY: γαστήρ, belly; the genus *Boletus*. Gender: m. — Type species (only original species): [*Gastroboletus boedijni* Lohwag].[7]—Although the genus was already described in 1926, it was not until 1937 that the author properly named its only species. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Gasteroboletus*"; W. B. Cooke, Gen. Homobas. 38. 1953.

Girodon.— See *Gyrodon*.

Gymnopus (Quél.) Quél. *apud* Moug. & Ferry, Champ. *in* Louis, Départ. Vosges, Fl. Vosges 476 (108, reprint pagination). 1887. — ETYMOLOGY: γυμνός, naked; πούς, foot. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (same as of basinym): *Boletus granulatus* L. ex Fr. — BASINYM: *Viscipellis* [subgen.] *Gymnopus* Quél., Ench. Fung. 156. 1886.[8]—This name was not mentioned, but there can be no doubt it being basinym of the generic name. It was introduced for the ringless species of *Viscipellis* Quél. (1886), the ring bearing ones being called *Viscipellis* [subgen.] *Peplopus* Quél., basinym of *Peplopus* (Quél.) Quél. — SCOPE. Same as of basinym. — TYPIFICATION. The best known and perhaps most common representative in France is

[7] According to W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 38. 1953) this species belongs to *Truncocolumella* Zeller (synonym, *Dodgea* Malençon).

[8] Kallenbach (*in* Pilze Mitteleurop. 1: 70. 1930) cited "*Gymnopus bovina* Quél. 1886," etc. as synonyms. This is evidently an error. See also under *Chlorosiphon*.

selected here. — REMARK. These generic names, *Peplopus* and *Gymnopus*, have been overlooked and no species have so far been suggested as types. I assume that Quélet himself is their author because the names appear in a catalogue "dressé par Antoine Mougeot . . . et par Réné Ferry, avec le concours de M. Quélet . . . et de M. Forquignon . . ." If this supposition would prove to be incorrect, the citation of the names would presumably become '*Peplopus* (Quél.) Moug. & Ferry' and '*Gymnopus* (Quél.) Moug. & Ferry' respectively. — HOMONYM: *Gymnopus* (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray 1821 ("Agaricaceae"). — TYPONYM: *Rostkovites* P. Karst. (1881). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Gyrodon Opat. *in* Arch. Naturgesch. 2 (1) : 5. 1836 (description reproduced by Kallenbach *in* Pilze Mitteleurop. 1: 113. 1936). — ETYMOLOGY: γῦρος, ring; ὀδών, tooth. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus sistotremoides* Fr. = *B. sistotrema* Fr.—An as yet unidentifiable species (see below). — SCOPE. See below. — TYPIFICATION. The first of Opatowski's two species (*B. sistotremoides*) was designated as the type by Fries (Epicr. 414. 1838) and Maire [*in* Publ. Inst. bot., Barcelona 3 (4) : 42. 1937]. The second species (*Boletus volvatus* Pers.) has been placed in a genus of its own: *Volvoboletus* P. Henn., q.v. — Many modern authors have been acting as if *Boletus lividus* Bull. ex Fr. were the type species; it has even been suggested or indicated as such: Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 347. 1931), Gilbert (Bolets 103. 1931), Konrad (*in* Schweiz. Z. Pilzk. 10: 149. 1932; *in* Bull. mens. Soc. linn. Lyon 1: 116. 1932), and Singer (*in* Ann. mycol. 34: 326. 1936; *in* Rev. Mycol. 5: 37. 1938); all incorrectly ascribing the combination *Gyrodon lividum* to Opatowski. — O. Kuntze [Rev. Gen. Pl. 3 (2) : 482. 1898] 'restored' the name for *Volvoboletus* P. Henn., q.v., a genus based on Opatowoski's second species, *B. volvatus*. — REMARK. I reproduce two authorative comments on the status of the type species:

"Die Gattung *Gyrodon* wurde im Jahr 1836 von Opatowski ursprünglich für 2 Literaturarten aufgestelt, *sistotremoides* Fr. und *volvatus* Pers. Die Beschreibungen folgen als Fussnote. Alle beiden Arten sind sehr kritisch. Der letztere Pilz ist in der Natur wohl gar nicht vorhanden, sondern war nach Quélet vielleicht nur eine Missbildung von *Amanita vaginata*.[9]

"*Boletus sistotremoides* Fr. = [*Boletus*] *Sistotrema* Fr. ist mir ebenfalls noch nicht zu Gesicht gekommen. Auch habe ich in der Literatur noch keine ganz klaren Anhaltspunkte dafür gefunden. Fries bezweifelt diese Art selbst, er bemerkt zu diesem Pilz: 'An vero monstrosa progenies' und 'Typus generis *Gyrodontis* Opat. sed omnes ejus species sunt modo *Boleti* deformes.' Den wirklichen Grübling — vielleicht die einzige europaische *Gyrodon*-Species — hat Opatowski überhaupt nicht zu seiner neuen Gattung *Gyrodon* gezogen, sondern er führt ihn als *lividus* unter *Boletus* auf!

[9] See also under *Volvoboletus*.

Also wieder eine Nomenclaturkomödie, wobei der Name *Gyrodon* heute für etwas Geltung hat, wofür er ursprunglich gar nicht gemünzt war. . . ."—Kallenbach (*in* Pilze Mitteleurop. 1: 113-114. 1936; compare also *in* Z. Pilzk. 8: 90-96 1929).

Singer's real conclusion is ingeniously covered by the next comment:

"Konrad and Maublanc [Ic. sel. Fung. 6: 474. 1937] and other authors think that *G. sistotrema* and *G. sistotremoides* are synonyms of *G. lividus*, and judging from the description which is the only document we have, we admit that there is no good reason for eliminating this species from *Gyrodon* since it may well pass as an extreme form [of] *G. lividus*. It would thus become a form with more elongated stipe and 'whitish' context, and the configuration of the hymenophore described by Fries would find its logical explanation when considered to be of the type observed in old stages of *Gyrodon lividus* rather than by looking for rare deformations in other genera. The secret of *Gyrodon sistotrema* will never be lifted in an absolutely conclusive way, and, as it seems to us, it would be best to let it go at that, and not cause nomenclatural trouble by refusing 'endorsement' of this species as a *Gyrodon* sensu stricto. The general consensus appears to be rather to model *Gyrodon* along the characters of *Gyrodon lividus* even at the risk of having to conserve the generic name *Gyrodon* in this sense."—Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 243-244. 1945).

The identity of *Boletus sistrotema* (orignally called *B. sistotremoides*) has not yet been settled, although some authors are disposed to identify it with *Boletus lividus*; compare Singer's note just quoted and a later one (*in* Sydowia 5: 449. 1951) in which he reported that "the specimen in the Fries Herbarium was sent from France by Quélet and was determined by Fries himself as *Boletus* (*Gyrodon*) *sistotremoides* Fr. It has the characteristic small and short spores of *Gyrodon lividus*, viz. 5.5—6 × 3.7—4.5 μ; clamp connections are present." In a later work Fries (Hym. europ. 519. 1874) cited "Karst. Finl. Polyp. p. 14. Quélet Jur. p. 243. *B. brachyporus* Rostk. t. 11 (colore recedens)" as belonging to *B. sistotrema*. Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 243. 1945) thinks that Karsten's fungus is nothing but *Boletus bovinus* Fr. since that author indicated the spores as being elongate. However, Quélet's fungus (as we have also seen from the specimens in Fries's herbarium) is clearly *B. lividus* and the same applies to Rostkovius's (" . . . in der Nähe van Elsbrüchern"). Thus it may be concluded that, apart from some errors, Fries at the end of his life attributed to *B. sistrotrema* specimens of a species (*B. lividus*) he kept apart from it in his then remote youth. *Boletus sistotrema* he collected only once about 1815!

On the other hand Fries, who knew *Boletus lividus*, never *consciously* admitted their conspecificity! He strongly doubted that *B. sistotrema* was a normal growth-form: "An vero monstrosa progenies? Nullo vero fungo a me viso similis" (Obs. mycol. 1: 120. 1815); "Valde similis *B. volvato* Pers. . . . ; ceterumque unica vice observatus, quare haud recepimus"

(Boleti 6. 1835); "Typus generis *Gyrodontis* Opat., sed omnes ejus species sunt modo *Boleti* deformes" (Epicr. 414. 1838). From his descriptions, too, it would appear to differ from *B. lividus* in several important characters: ". . . Hymenio gyroso-poroso venoso denticulato, gyris a pileo separabilis . . . margine interdum poris angulatis integris; tubulis . . . a substantia propria formatis et a pileo liberis, et medio in dentes difformo compressos obtusos lacerum" (1815); "Hymenium *Merulii* fere *lacrimantis*" (Syst. mycol. 1: 389. 1821)[10]; "Caro . . . albida immutabilis" (1815); and "Pinet. raro" (1935), "In silvis siccis inter *Vaccinia*" (Hym. europ. 519. 1874). All these items make it very difficult, if not quite impossible, to identify it with *B. lividus*, and I would reject Singer's conclusion that *B. sistotrema* is a form of *B. lividus* with more elongated stipe, whitish context, and the configuration of the hymenophore of old stages.

If only really wants to retain the name *Gyrodon* as it is now generally applied, it might appear more satisfactory not to play ostrich policy but to put the name on a secure basis by proposing it as a nomen conservandum with *Boletus lividus* as the type. This could be done by conserving, for instance, *Gyrodon* sensu Gilbert (Bolets 102. 1931) against *Gyrodon* Opat. Otherwise, it will be only a matter of time before *Uloporus* Quél. is revived to take the place of *Gyrodon* in its present application. The genus, even when enlarged by the incorporation of *Boletinellus* Murrill (1909), is only a small one containing hardly more than about eight species. This consideration coupled with the fact that there is a priorable name available for the group (*Uloporus*) are the reasons why I do not think a case can be made for formally moving such a proposal. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Girodon*"; *in* Rev. mycol. 5: 127. 1883.—An unintentional error.

Gyroporus Quél., Ench. Fung. 161. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: *γῦρος*, ring; *πόρος*, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus cyanescens* Bull. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with seven species, of which *Boletus cyanescens* is the first. — TYPIFICATION. Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 14. 1909; *in* N. Amer. Fl. 9: 133. 1910) indicated the first species as the type. He was followed by Gilbert (Bolets 101. 1931), Singer (*in* Ann. mycol. 34: 325. 1936; *in* Farlowia 2: 231. 1945; *in* Lilloa 22: 643. 1951), and Maire [*in* Publ Inst. bot., Barcelona 3 (4): 42. 1937]. — Konrad (*in* Schweiz. Z. Pilzk. 12: 178. 1934) selected *Boletus castaneus* Bull. "ex Fries" and this species was also listed by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 42. 1953) for *Gyroporus* "Quél. em. Pat. . . . 1887." — TYPONYMS: *Suillus* P. Karst.

[10] For excellent photographs of the hymenial configuration of *B. lividus*, see Kallenbach (*in* Pilze Mitteleurop. 1: *pl. 10 fs. 5, 7, pl. 44 fs. 74*).

(1882; preoccupied), *Lactisuillus* O.K. (1898; not validly published), *Coelopus* Bataille (1908), and *Leucoconius* (Reichenb.) ex Beck (1923).

Heimiella Boedijn *in* Sydowia 5: 216. 1951. — ETYMOLOGY: R. Heim. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species) : *Boletus retisporus* Pat. & C. F. Baker.

"*Heterosarcus.*"—See under "*Chlorosiphon.*"

"*Holosiphon.*"—See under "*Chlorosiphon.*"

"*Homosarcus.*"—See under "*Chlorosiphon.*"

Hypolepia Rafin.—See Deuteromycetes.

Ixechinus Heim *in* C.R. Acad. Sci., Paris 208: 375. 1939 (nomen nudum) ; *in* Rev. Mycol. 4: 20. 1939 (nomen nudum). — Introduced with two species, *Ixechinus majus* Heim (selected here as the type species) and *I. minus* Heim. — No Latin description. When in the same year Heim (*in* Rev. Mycol. 4: 5-20. 1939) dealt more fully with the genus, he published Latin descriptions for the two species, but not for the genus. This omission has not yet been made good by subsequent authors like Singer (*in* Ann. mycol. 40: 46, 1942), who accepted the genus, or Singer (*in* Lilloa 22: 687. 1951), when he placed it among the "genera incertae sedis."

Ixocomus Quél., Fl. mycol. France 411. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: ἰξός, bird-lime, glue; κόμη, hair. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected) : *Boletus luteus* L. ex Fr. — BASINYM: *Viscipellis* Quél., Ench. Fung. 155. 1886.— *Ixocomus* is an undeniable and mere name change for *Viscipellis* Quél. (1886), q.v., although this was not especially stated. — TYPIFICATION. Acceptance of the foregoing conclusion makes *Boletus luteus* the correct type species; it was already proposed by Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 258. 1945). — Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 140. 1909) regarded Quélet's first species under *Ixonomus*, *Boletus badius* Fr., as the type. There is no indication that when Quélet changed the name of his genus, he also changed its type. — The same argument can be invoked to reject *Boletus granulatus* L. ex Fr., selected by Gilbert (Bolets 92. 1931) and Singer (*in* Ann. mycol. 34: 325. 1936). — TYPONYMS: *Suillus* S. F. Gray (1821), *Cricunopus* P. Karst. (1881), *Viscipellis* Quél. (1886), *Peplopus* (Quél.) Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry (1887), and *Boletopsis* P. Henn. (1989; preoccupied). And compare *Boletus* L. ex Fr.

Krombholzia P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. 3 (No. 9): 17. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: J. von Krombholz. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus versipellis* Fr.—This species (cf. Lundell *in* Lund. & Nannf., Fungi exs. suec. No. 1305. 1946) is very common in Sweden, where *Boletus aurantiacus* Bull. ex Hook. has not been found as yet. It was correctly interpreted by Karsten (cf. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 37: 17. 1882). There is not much room for doubt as to which species Fries called *B. versipellis*. — In France both *B. versipellis* and *B. aurantiacus* are common and have been confused in such a manner that even now many French authors (Gilbert is an exception) prefer to list *B. versipellis* as a synonym of *B. aurantiacus* or to reject the name altogether. This may explain why Maire mentioned the type species of his name change for the present generic name, *Krombholziella*, q.v., as *B. aurantiacus*. — As to the correct name of *B. versipellis* Fr., this problem does not need to be solved in the present paper, but it can already be confidently stated that the name *B. versipellis* ought not be listed as a synonym of *B. aurantiacus* s. str. as has been done by Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 123. 1947). — SCOPE. Two species were mentioned, *Boletus versipellis* and *B. scaber* Bull. ex Fr. Although this was not explicitly indicated, the genus was introduced for *Boletus* sect. *Versipelles* Fr. (Epicr. 423. 1838; Hym. europ. 514. 1874). — TYPIFICATION. It is difficult to choose between the two mentioned species: *B. versipellis* has its epithet in common with that of Fries's section name of the group which Karsten had in mind when establishing the genus; on the other hand Fries (Summa Veg. Scand. 2: 318. 1849) once called the same group "Stirps *B. scabri.*" The first species, *Boletus versipellis*, was considered the type by Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 140. 1909) and Maire (see under *Krombholziella*); it was also selected by Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 110. 1947). — Gilbert (Bolets 98. 1931), Konrad (*in* Schweiz. Z. Pilzk. 10: 149. 1932; *in* Bull. mens. Soc. linn. Lyon 1: 117. 1932; for the name reduced to subgeneric rank), and Singer (*in* Ann. mycol. 34: 325. 1936) selected *Boletus scaber*. — HOMONYM: *Krombholzia* Rupr. ex Galeotti (1842; nomen nudum) ex Fourn. (1876; Gramineae).— Also spelt *Krombholtzia* [Bentham *in* J. Linn. Soc. (Bot.) 19: 121. 1881, in synonymy]. Compare also Snell (*in* Mycologia 34: 406. 1942).[11] — ISONYM: *Krombholziella* Maire (1937). — TYPONYMS. Compare *Leccinum* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Trachypus* Bataille (1908; preoccupied). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym, and, therefore, changed into *Krombholziella*.

[11] Singer's remarks on this subject (*in* Ann. mycol. 40: 32. 1942) are partly erroneous.

Krombholziella Maire *in* Publ. Inst. bot., Barcelona 3 (4): 41. 1937.[12] — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Krombholzia*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected for basinym): *Boletus versipellis* Fr.—Listed by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 52. 1953) as "*K. versipellis* (Fr.)." Called "*K. aurantiaca* (Roques ex Bull.) Maire" by Maire (*l.c.*) and "*K. aurantiaca*" by Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 110. 1947). — BASINYM: *Krombholzia* P. Karst. (1881), q.v. — VALID PUBLICATION. No description. *Krombholziella* was validly published by the reference "*Krombholzia* Karst. 1881," thus as a mere name change; it must have the same type species as its basinym. — TYPONYMS. Compare *Leccinum* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Trachypus* Bataille (1908; preoccupied).

Lactisuillus O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. 3 (2): 536. 1898 (nomen provisorium). — A provisional name and hence not validly published: "Wollte man *Suillus* Karsten [q.v.] aufrecht erhalten, so musste man dieser Gruppe einen neuen Namen z.B. *Lactisuillus* geben." — Typonyms: *Coelopus* Bataille (1908) and *Leucoconius* (Reichenb.) ex Beck (1923).

Leccinum S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. 1: 646. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: leccino, Italian fungus name. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES: (selected): *Boletus aurantiacus* Bull. — SCOPE. The genus, as introduced by Gray, almost covers Persoon's *Boletus* "A. Pileo pulvinato carnoso, a tubis elongatis facile se disuingeste. (SUILLI *veterum*)" (Syn. Fung. 503. 1801). It may be recalled in this connection that Persoon at that time combined the polypores and the boletes into a single genus, *Boletus* L., the whole of the boletes making up his group A. Only in one regard does *Leccinum* differ in circumscription from Persoon's group A: the first two species, possessing a ring, were excluded and each was placed in a genus of its own, *Suillus* S. F. Gray and *Pinuzza* S. F. Gray, and *Leccinum* was thus reserved for all boletes without a ring. Shortly before, in the same year, Fries had restricted *Boletus* L. by excluding the polypores; except for the ringed species (not excluded by Fries), *Boletus* Fr., too, and *Leccinum* are the same. Gray treated ten (British) species, the first being *Boletus aurantiacus* Bull. Certain modern mycologists who apply a narrow generic concept in Boletaceae distribute the species dealt with by Gray over several genera: (i) *Boletus* Fr. restr. (actual type species, *Boletus edulis*), four species; (ii) *Krombholzia* P. Karst. = *Krombholziella* Maire, two species, one of which is Gray's first; (iii) *Suillus* S. F. Gray emend. Snell, two

[12] In the text of this publication, *Krombholziella* is dated 1935, and Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 110. 1947; *in* Lilloa 22: 683. 1951) also gave 1935 as the date of publication. However, the actual date is 1937.

species; (iv) *Xerocomus* Quél. (= *Versipellis* Quél.), one species; and (v) *Gyroporus* Quél., one species, Thus about half the number of Gray's species form a coherent group, corresponding to Gilbert's *Boletus* Fr. *sensu stricto*. — TYPIFICATION. Gray's generic description reveals only one feature from which *Leccium* differs from his genera *Suillus* and *Pinuzza*, "collar o," and none of the original species agrees better with it than any of the others. All and all together, one cannot escape the conclusion that the selection of a species of the *Boletus* element in its strictest and current sense would have been a judicious choice. However, another species has already been chosen. — Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 140. 1909), acting in accordance with the first-species rule, indicated *Boletus aurantiacus* Bull. and treated *Leccinum* as a synonym of *Ceriomyces* "Battar." Snell (*in* Mycologia 34: 405-406. 1942) chose Gray's second species, "*L. scabrum* (Bull. ex Fr.) S. F. Gray." Simultaneously he "also proposed that *Leccinum* S. F. Gray . . . be adopted for [*Boletus* sect.] *Versipellis* of Fries and Peck in place of *Trachypus* Bataille (1908)." He was apparently unaware of Murrill's previous selection. Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 111. 1947) reverted to "*B. aurantiacus* Bull.," which he afterwards selected again [Singer *in* Lilloa 22: 683. 1951; as "*L. aurantiacum* (Bull. ex) S. F. Gray"]. Both species, *B. aurantiacus* and *B. scaber*, represent the *Krombholziella* element. — REMARK. Gray gave Micheli as the author of the name. The latter (Micheli, Nov. Pl. Gen. 128. 1729) mentioned the popular Italian name leccino under his tenth species of *Suillus* Mich.[13]: *Suillus esculentus, crassus, superne fulvus, inferne luteus, pediculo concolore, rugoso, & aspero* Mich. — TYPONYMS. Compare *Krombholzia* P. Karst. (1881; preoccupied) and *Krombholziella* Maire (1937), and *Trachypus* Bataille (1908; preoccupied).

Leucobolites Beck *in* Z. Pilzk. 2: 142. 1923. — ETYMOLOGY: *λευκός*, white; *βωλίτης*, ancient fungus name (see under *Boletus*). Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus castaneus* Bull.—When validly re-publishing Bulliard's name in the starting-point book, Fries (Syst. mycol. 1: 392. 1821) misapplied it. He himself detected his error and in 1838 (Epicr. 420, 426) used Bulliard's name in its original sense, renaming his own species of 1821 *Boletus vaccinus* Fr. It is not precisely known what the latter name really covers. — There is no doubt about the species Beck von Mannagetta had in mind: Bulliard's species. — SCOPE. Introduced

[13] In Micheli's "Index italicus" leccino is listed for page 171 only. On the page cited "Leccino giallo" is given under one of the species of *Fungus* Tourn.; the mushroom involved is an agaric.

with five species. — TYPIFICATION. The species indicated is the best known representative. It has already been selected: "The genus *Leucobolites* Beck is obviously framed around the characters of *Gyroporus castaneus*, the first species cited . . . ."—Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 231. 1945). The same species had been suggested before by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fung. 346. 1931).

Leucoconium.—See *Leucoconius*.

Leucoconius (Reichenb.) *ex* Beck *in* Z. Pilzk. 2: 146. 1923. — ETYMOLOGY: λευκός, white; κονία, dust. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus cyanescens* Bull. ex Fr. — PROTONYM: *Boletus* sect. *Leucoconius* Reichenb., Repert. Herb. s. Nomencl. 12. 1841.—Nomen nudum. Introduced for *Boletus* sect. *Leucosporus* Fr. — REMARK. When Beck von Managetta introduced the genus he explicitly excluded *Boletus castaneus* Bull. ex Fr., the only species admitted being *Boletus cyanescens*. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Leucoconium*"; W. B. Cooke, Gen. Homobas. 57. 1953. — TYPONYMS. *Gyroporus* Quél. (1886) and *Coelopus* Bataille (1908).

Leucocricos (J. Schroet.) Smotlacha *in* S.B. böhm. Ges. Wiss., Math.-nat. Cl. **1911** (8): 32. 1912 (in synonymy). — Smotlacha listed the generic name ". . . *Leucocricos* Karsten 1882, Schroeter 1889, Schenk 1890" as a synonym of *Boletopsis* P. Henn. What he referred to should have been cited as *Boletus* [sect.] *Leucocricos* J. Schoet *in* Cohn, Krypt.-Fl. Schles. 3 (1): 498. 1888. Schroeter's only species is "*B*[*oletus*] *viscidus* Linné 1755," which, in his interpretation, may well be *Boletus viscidus* "L." ex Fr. 1835 = *Boletus aeruginascens* Secr. 1833.

Leucogyropus Snell *in* Mycologia 34: 408. 1942. — ETYMOLOGY: λευκός, white; the genus *Gyroporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Gyroporus pisciodorus* Murrill.—Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 99. 1947) reduced this species to a synonym of *Boletus tabacinus* Peck. — SCOPE. Introduced with four species. — REMARK. The name *Leucogyroporus* was coined on the base of an erroneous statement communicated to its author, viz., that the spore prints were white in the type species. The name *Aeruginospora* Höhn. ("Agaricaceae") represents a similar case.

Mison Adans.—See "Polyporaceae." Cited by Steudel [Nomencl. bot. Pl. crypt. 76. 1824; as "*Mison*. Adans. (ex parte)"] as a synonym of *Boletus* L., Fr.

Mycenoporella Overeem.—See "Agaricaceae."

Oedipus Bataille *in* Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Doubs No. 15: 13 (reprint pagination). 1908. — ETYMOLOGY: *οἰδίπους*, swollen footed. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus edulis* Bull. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for the largest part of *Boletus* L. ex Fr., q.v., with 25 species distinguished in a key. — TYPIFICATION. Its best known representative was selected by Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 20. 1947). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Oedopus* Pat."; W. B. Cooke, Gen. Homobas. 67. 1953. — TYPONYMS: *Tubiporus* Paul. ex P. Karst. (1881), *Dictyopus* Quél. (1886), and *Ceriomyces* Murrill (1909; preoccupied). Compare also *Boletus* L. ex Fr. and *Suillus* [Haller] O.K. (1898; preoccupied).

Oedopus.—See *Oedipus*.

Paragyrodon (Sing.) Sing. *in* Ann. mycol. 40: 25. 1942. — ETYMOLOGY: *παρά*, next to; the genus *Gyrodon*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Boletus sphaerosporus* Peck. — BASINYM: *Gyrodon* subgen. *Paragyrodon* Sing. *in* Rev. Mycol. 5: 7. 1940, "subgen. (an gen.?) nov."—Latin description.

Peplopus (Quél.) Quél. *apud* Moug. & Ferry, Champ. *in* L. Louis, Départ. Vosges, Fl. Vosges 476 (108, reprint pagination). 1887. — ETYMOLOGY: *πέπλος*, garment, veil; *πούς*, foot. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus luteus* L. ex Fr. — BASINYM: *Viscipellis* [subgen.] *Peplopus* Quél., Ench. Fung. 155. 1886.[14]—Including the ringed species of *Viscipellis* Quél. — SCOPE. Same as of basinym. — TYPIFICATION. Because *Viscipellis* was divided in 1887 into two new genera (*Peplopus* and *Gymnopus*) representing the two original subdivisions of the genus, and the type of *Viscipellis*, q.v., belongs to the *Peplopus* part, it is here also selected as the type species of *Peplopus* (infrageneric as well as generic name). — The indication as the type of Quellet's first species of 1886 by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 71. 1953), viz., of *Boletus sphaerocephalus* Barla, is an example of a rigid application of the first-species rule and shows that the author did not even take the trouble to gather some basic information about his "choice." About this species, compare Gilbert [Bolets 123-129. 1931, under *Ixocomus sul[f]ureus* (Fr.) E. J. Gilb.]. This species must be rejected as non-eligible because it does not answer to the subgeneric description, "stipite annulo membranaceo vestito." It does not have a ring that remains attached to the stem as in the other species

[14] Kallenbach (*in* Pilze Mitteleur. 1: 37, etc. 1928, etc.) cited "*Peplopus flava* (With.) Quél. . . . 1886," etc., as synonyms. This is evidently an error. See also under "*Chlorosiphon*."

included by Quélet: as Gilbert writes, "Il n'y a d'autre anneau que la prolifération de la marge piléique," a structure not attached to the stem and evidently accidental at that. Not only in this respect is *Boletus sphaerocephalus* atypical: it also has spores agreeing with those of *Uloporus* Quél. ("*Gyrodon* Opat."), while those of the other (eight) original species are rather fusiform. — REMARKS. About the author of the name, see under *Gymnopus*. — *Peplopus* has sometimes been taken as published as a generic name in 1886: compare Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 48: 277. 1889; as a synonym of *Cricunopus* P. Karst.) and W. B. Cooke (*l.c.*). This is incorrect since in 1886 Quélet did not use *Peplopus* in generic rank. — TYPONYMS: *Suillus* S. F. Gray (1821), *Cricunopus* P. Karst. (1881), *Viscipellis* Quél. (1886), *Ixocomus* Quél. (1888), and *Boletopsis* P. Henn. (1898; preoccupied). And compare *Boletus* L. ex Fr. (1821).

Phaeogyroporus Sing. *in* Mycologia 36: 360. 1944. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dusky; the genus *Gyrodon*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Boletus braunii* Bres. — SCOPE. Introduced for two species.

Phaeoporus Bataille *in* Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Doubs No. 15: 11 (reprint pagination). 1908. — Etymology: φαιός, dusky, "gris brun"; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus porphyrosporus* Fr. = *Boletus pseudoscaber* Secr. — HOMONYM: *Phaeoporus* J. Schroet. (1888; "Polyporaceae"). — ISONYM: *Porphyrellus* E. J. Gilb. 1931, q.v. — TYPONYM: *Porphyrosporus* (Smotl.) ex Konr. & Maubl. (1937; not validly published) and compare *Rhodobolites* Beck (1923). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym, and, therefore, changed into *Porphyrellus*.

Phlebopus (Heim) Sing. *in* Ann. mycol. 34: 326. 1936; *in* Ann. mycol. 40: 25. 1942. — ETYMOLOGY: φλέψ, φλεβός, vein; πούς, foot. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Boletus colossus* Heim. — BASINYM: *Boletus* subgen. *Phlebopus* Heim *in* Rev. Mycol. 1: 9. 1936 (with Latin description).—Introduced for one species, *B. colossus*. — SCOPE & VALID PUBLICATION. The valid publication as a generic name by Singer in 1936 (*l.c.*) is somewhat doubtful. He accepted the taxon in generic rank, but hardly anything amounting to a German, and no Latin, description was added. Thus, all depends on whether or not one agrees to find a valid reference to a description of the taxon as a subgenus in "*Phlebopus* (Heim 1936) Singer (1936) Char.: Heim." Heim's paper is not mentioned in the list of literature appended to Singer's publication. In 1942 there is no omission of this kind: "Was die Gattungsdiagnose . . . betrifft, verweise

ich auf Heim, Revue de Mycologie 1936, no. 1, p. 6-10." In any case the original scope is the same as of the basinym. — TYPIFICATION. The only species of the basinym has been explicitly indicated as the type by Singer (*l.c.*, 1936; *in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 2. 1947; *in* Lilloa 22: 671. 1951).

Phorima Rafin.—See "Polyporaceae."

Phylloboletellus Sing. *apud* Sing. & Digil. *in* Lilloa 25: 438. 1952. — ETYMOLOGY: *φύλλον*, leaf; the genus *Boletellus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Phylloboletellus chloephorus* Sing. apud Sing. & Digil.

Phyllobolites Sing.—See "Agaricaceae."

Phylloporus Quél., Fl. mycol. France 409. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: *φύλλον*, leaf; *πόρος*, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Agaricus pelletieri* Lév. apud Crouan = *Paxillus paradoxus* (Kalchbr.) Quél. = *Phylloporus rhodoxanthus* (Schw.) Bres. — HOMONYM. Compare *Phylloporis* Clem. (1909; Strigulaceae, Lichenes).

Pinuzza S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. 1: 646. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: pinuzzo, Italian fungus name. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus flavus* With. ("Bolt.").[15] — REMARK. Gray indicated Micheli as the author of the name *Pinuzza*. Micheli (Nova Pl. Gen. 127-129. 1729) only mentioned pinuzzo as a vernacular name under a number of species of *Suillus* Mich.

Polyporellus "Gilbert" (non P. Karst.).—See *Porphyrellus*.

Polyporoletus Snell.—See "Polyporaceae."

Porphyrellus E. J. Gilb., Bolets 75, 99. 1931. — ETYMOLOGY: *πορφυροῦς*, purple. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym; by original designation for isonym): *Boletus porphyrosporus* Fr. = *Boletus pseudoscaber* Secr. (an earlier name). — BASINYM: *Phaeoporus* Bataille (1908), q.v.—*Porphyrellus* is an avowed isonym; the basinym is preoccupied (cf. Gilbert, *op. cit.* p. 75). — SCOPE. Gilbert included the type and three other species. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Polyporellus*"; W. B. Cooke, Gen. Homobas. 80. 1953.—Evidently a slip; not *Polyporellus* P. Karst. ("Polyporaceae"). — TYPONYM: *Porphyrosporus* (Smotl.) ex Konr. &

[15] Not *Boletus flavus* Pollini (Fl. veron. 3: "507" [607]. 1824), a species cited by Murrill (*in* N. Amer. Fl. 9: 86. 1908) as a synonym of *Inonotus hirsutus* (Scop.) Murrill = *I. hispidus* (Bull. ex Fr.) P. Karst. (Hymenochaetaceae or "Polyporaceae"). Apparently the name *Boletus flavus* Pollini was not validly published: "*Boleti ignarii* varietas memorabilis, vel distincta forte species est: *Boletus* (*Polyporus*) *flavus* . . ."

Maubl. (1937; not validly published) and compare *Rhodobolites* Beck (1923).

Porphyrosporus (Smotl.) *ex* Konr. & Maubl., Ic. sel. Fung. 6: 451. 1937 (in synonymy). — This name is sometimes cited as a generic synonym. Smotlacha [*in* S.B. böhm. Ges. Wiss., Math.-nat. Cl. 1911 (8): 31. 1912] introduced only a subgenus *Porphyrosporus* of *Boletus*. That Gilbert (Bolets, 1931, cf. p. 75) had used it also as a generic name as was stated by Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 115. 1945) is not correct. "*Porphyrosporus* Smotlacha (1911)" was first cited as a generic synonym by Konrad & Maublanc (*l.c.*). And see under "*Chlorosiphon*." — Typonyms: *Phaeoporus* Bataille (1908; preoccupied), *Porphyrellus* E. J. Gilb. (1931), and compare *Rhodobolites* Beck (1923).

Poromycena Overeem.—See "Agaricaceae."

Porotheleum Fr.—See "Cyphellaceae."
Porothelium Fr.—See *Porotheleum*.

Psiloboletinus Sing. *in* Farlowia 2: 250. 1945. — ETYMOLOGY: ψιλός, naked; the genus *Boletinus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Phylloporus lariceti* Sing.

Pulveroboletus Murrill *in* Mycologia 1: 9. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: pulvis, -eris, dust; the genus *Boletus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Boletus ravenelii* Berk. & C.— For a re-description of this species, see Singer [*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 7. 1947, as *Pulveroboletus ravenelii* (Berk. & C.) Murrill].

Rhodobolites Beck *in* Z. Pilzk. 2: 147. 1923. — ETYMOLOGY: ῥόδον, rose; βωλίτης, ancient fungus name. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus roseus* Wint. — Winter's specific name is based on *Boletus alutarius* Fr. sensu Rostk. *Boletus roseus* Wint. has been interpreted with doubt either as *Boletus porphyrosporus* Fr. (= *B. pseudoscaber* Secr.) for instance by Gilbert (Bolets 217. 1931) and Gilbert & Leclair (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 58: 185. 1944), or as *B. felleus* Bull. ex Fr. for instance by Kallenbach (*in* Pilze Mitteleurop. 1: 136. 1938). Rostkovius gave three descriptions. (i) A Latin one copied from Fries (Epicr. 425. 1838), except for "[tubulisque . . .] albis, tritis fuscescentibus," which was replaced by "subroseis, fractis roseis." (ii) The next description is a German translation from the foregoing, with some grave errors, "pileo . . . velutino" being translated into, "Der Hut . . . mit einem Velum ver-

sehen"! This translation was apparently not made by Rostkovius. In any case it is evident that the veil (which induced the publication of the genus *Rhodobolites* Beck) is non-existent ! (iii) Finally, there is a more extensive and presumably 'personal' description. It rather points to *B. roseus:* pores "hell rosenfarben, werden nach dem Durchschneiden immer röther," but the net on the stem is not mentioned ("Der Stiel . . . ist höckerig-uneben"). The indicated taste of the flesh has to be left out of account because it is notoriously unreliable throughout Rostkovius's treatment of the boletes. Although figure 1 of Rostkovius's plate 42 slightly reminds one of *B. pseudoscaber*, figure 2 (section of fruit-body) cannot be anything else but a representation of *B. felleus* and I reduce *B. roseus* with some confidence to a synonym of that species. — TYPONYMS: *Tylopilus* P. Karst. (1881) and *Rhodoporus* Quél. ex Bataille (1908). — STATUS. It seems best, however, to regard *Rhodobolites* as a nomen dubium.

Rhodoporus Quél. *ex* Bataille *in* Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Doubs No. 15: 11 (reprint pagination). 1908. — ETYMOLOGY: ῥόδον, rose; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus felleus* Bull. ex Fr. — PROTONYM: *Rhodoporus* Quél., Fl. mycol. France 421. 1888.—A provisional name placed after the description of *Dictyopus* group b as "(*Rhodoporus*, Quél.)." The description of Quélet's only species of this group, *Boletus felleus*, is accompagnied by the footnote: „Il peut être considéré comme le type du genre *Rhodoporus*, analogue au genre *Rhodophyllus*." — SCOPE. When Bataile validly published Quélet's name he included two species, *Boletus felleus* and *B. alutarius* Fr. — TYPIFICATION. *Boletus felleus*, indicated as the type species by Quélet (see quotation) and Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 15. 1909) for the provisional name, was also selected by Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 89. 1947) for *Rhodoporus* as validly published by Bataille. — TYPONYM: *Tylopilus* P. Karst. (1881), and compare *Rhodobolites* Beck.

Rodwaya H. & P. Syd. *in* Hedwigia 40 (Beibl.): 2. 1901. — ETYMOLOGY: L. Rodway. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected for basinym): *Merulius infundibuliformis* Cooke & Mass. — BASINYM: *Campbellia* Cooke & Mass. (1890), q.v. — REMARKS. A name change, the basinym being preocuppied. — Murrill (*in* J. Mycol. 9: 101. 1930) and Imazeki (*in* Bull. Tokyo Sci. Mus. No. 6: 65. 1943) indicated *C. infundibuliformis* as the type species; Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 348. 1931) suggested *Campbellia africana* Cooke & Mass. — HOMONYM: *Rodwaya* F. MUELL. (1890; Burmanniaceae). — STATUS. Imporiable on account of the earlier homonym.

Rostkovites P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. 3 (No. 9) : 16. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: T. W. T. Rostkovius. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected) : *Boletus granulatus* L. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Four Finnish species were mentioned, the first being *Boletus granulatus*. — TYPIFICATION. Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1 : 12. 1909; *in* N. Amer. Fl. 9 : 153. 1910) took the first species as the type; Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 347. 1931), Maire [*in* Publ. Inst. bot., Barcelona. 3 (4) : 41. 1937], and Singer (*in* Farlowia 2 : 257. 1945) followed. — TYPONYM: *Gymnopus* (Quél.) Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry (1887; preoccupied).

Scutiger Paul. ex Murrill.—See "Polyporaceae."

Solenia "Hoffm."—See "Cyphellaceae."

Solenia [Hill] O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. 3 (2) : 521. 1898. — ETYMOLOGY: σωλήν, pipe. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected) : *Solenia pediculo crasso, punctato, brevi* Hill.—This has been incorrectly identified with *Boletus luteus* L. ex Fr.; it, rather, represents *Boletus bellini* Inz. (see below). — PRE-LINNEAN NAME: "*Solenia* John Hill 1751 und 1773 Nat. Hist. of Plants II : 38."[16]—O. Kuntze (*l.c.*). Introduced for a genus of Hill's Fungi, Class the Second ("such as grow erect, and consist of pedicels crowned with Heads") ; the taxon included the species with separable tube-layer, i.e. the boletes in general. Kuntze took 1735 as the starting-point date for generic names and, therefore, he considered Hill's name as validly published. — SCOPE & VALID PUBLICATION. Kuntze did not give a generic description and the valid publication of the name depends exclusively on the citation of *Solenia* Hill as quoted above.[17] The scope, therefore, would be exactly that of Hill's genus. However, Kuntze simultaneously restricted the genus to the ringed species, delimitating it in agreement with *Boletopsis* P. Henn., q.v.[18] — TYPIFICATION. Kuntze distinguished between two categories among Hill's species, such as were "lateinisch diagnosticirt" and such as were "nur englisch benannt" and "als nomina nuda nicht mitzählen." Of the first category Kuntze mentioned two species, *Solenia petiolo* [= *pedicu-*

[16] The second date stands for "eine andere Auflage von 1773 in Berlin vorhanden, welche aber nur für pag. 643/4 . . . und pag. 645-671 . . . und dazu gehörigen Abbildungen ein Neudruck ist."—O. Kuntze (Rev. Gen. Pl. 1: cxxx. 1897). As in other similar cases (cf. *Hypochnus* Fr., "Thelephoraceae"), unchanged re-issues and new impressions are better not considered separate publications, and consequently I would rather not regard *Solenia* as re-published in 1773 (which would make it a devalidated name). The same applies to translations that do not contain altered or new matter (see also under *Xyloglossum* Pers. ex Link, "Clavariaceae").

[17] The present Code admits valid publication by means of a reference to pre-starting-point descriptions.

[18] "Ich will nicht die Berechtigung der Gattung behandeln, . . . das mögen die Mycologen unter sich ausstreiten."—Kuntze.

lo] *bulboso* Hill and *Solenia pediculo crasso, punctato, brevi* Hill, and a third, which he excluded. The two admitted, he identified with "*Boletus flavidus* Fries" (according to Streinz, Nomencl. Fung. 148. 1862) and "*Boletus luteus* L." respectively. He did not appoint the type species. This identification of Hill's two species with ringed bolets is a palpable error. For none of the two did Hill mention a ring; both his descriptions, although they impress one at first as orginal (Hill cited British localities), are evidently taken from two of Micheli's illustrated species of *Suillus* Mich. (the boletes in general) and in none is a ring drawn or mentioned by Micheli; both are rather more readily identifiable with species not characterized by a ring. The first of Hill's species corresponds to *Suillus esculentus, superne pulchre fulvus, inferne citrinus, & subtilissimo perforatus, pedilo concolore* Mich. (Nov. Pl. Gen. 128 *pl. 68 f. 1.* 1729), although this is not mentioned; the second, to *Suillus esculentus, crassus, magnus, vernus, pileola supina parte fulvo, prona luteo, pediculo crassiore, concolore, punctis, & lituris rubris notata* Mich. (*op. cit.* p. 129 *pl. 69 f. 2*). Persoon (Mycol. europ. 2: 143. 1825) introduced the name *Boletus leoninus* Pers. for the first of these species and *Boletus circinans* var. *leptopus* Pers. (*op. cit.* p. 127), for the second. It is possible that *B. leoninus* may be identified with *Boletus impolitus* Fr., as has been occassionnally done; while *B. circinans* var. *leptopus* is likely to be synonymous with *Boletus bellini* Inz. [cf. Gilbert, Bolets 115, 129. 1931, as *Ixocomus leptopus* (Pers.) E. J. Gilb.]. The second species is here selected as the type. The erroneous identification of this species with *Boletus luteus* by Kuntze is apparently due to Hill's remark, "Dillenius calls it, *Boletus luteus.*" — W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 90. 1953) listed "*Solenia* Hill. ex O. Kuntze" with "*Solenia caripes* (Kalchbr.) O. Kuntze" as the type species. Evidently *Boletus cavipes* Opat. was meant; it was not explained on what grounds this species could be taken as eligible. — HOMONYMS: *Solena* Lour. (1790; Cucurbitaceae), *Solena* Willd. (1797; Rubiaceae), *Solenia* Agardh (1822; Ulvaceae, Chlorophyta), and *Solenia* Pers. (1794) ex Fr. (1822; "Cyphellaceae").

Strobilofungus "McGinty": Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. 4 (Lett. No. 59): 7. Oct. 1915; 4: 538. Dec. 1915. — Compare Stevenson & Cash (*in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 142. 1936):

"Based on *Strobilomyces pallescens* Cke. & Mass. Lloyd uses the specific name *pallidus*, but in error, and later (Myc. Writ. 5: 663, April 1917) corrects it. The new genus was suggested on ground of a difference in spore shape from typical *Strobilomyces* spp. Lloyd did not actually use the name in his herbarium and it might well be deleted."

Not validly published. For some general considerations on the McGinty names, see Part I of the present series (Donk *in* Reinwardtia 1: 205. 1951). — Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 123. 1945; *in* Lilloa 22: 695. 1951) identified *S. pallescens* Cooke & Mass. with *Boletus* (= *Boletellus*) *ananas* Curt., the type species of *Boletellus* Murrill (1909).

Strobilomyces Berk. *in* Hook. J. Bot. II 3: 78. 1851. — ETYMOLOGY: στροβίλος, fir cone; μύκης, fungus. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus strobilaceus* Scop. ex Fr. = *Boletus floccopus* Vahl ex Fr.; compare Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 108. 1945). — SCOPE. The name was introduced on the occasion of the publication of *Strobilomyces polypyramis* Hook. f. apud Berk. and *S. montosus* Berk., both Asiatic species. "*Strobilomyces strobilaceus*" was only mentioned as being allied to each of the two. — TYPIFICATION. Although only casually mentioned when the generic name was published, it can be safely accepted that *Boletus strobilaceus* stood foremost in Berkeley's mind when he introduced the genus; this species has been generally accepted as the type: Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 8. 1909; *in* N. Amer. Fl. 9: 157. 1910[19]), Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 347. 1931), Gilbert (Bolets 111. 1931), Konrad (*in* Schweiz. Z. Pilzk. 10: 149. 1932; *in* Bull. mens. Soc. linn. Lyon 1: 116. 1932), Singer (*in* Ann. mycol. 34: 324. 1936; *in* Farlowia 2: 108. 1945; *in* Lilloa 22: 691. 1951), and Maire [*in* Publ. Inst. bot., Barcelona 3 (4): 42. 1937]. — REMARK. The place of publication is often incorrectly cited as "Berk., Outl. Brit. Fungol. 236. 1860." — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Strobylomyces*"; Pat., Hym. Eur. 132. 1887. — TYPONYM: *Eriocorys* Quél. (1886).

Strobylomyces.—See *Strobilomyces*.

Suillellus Murrill *in* Mycologia 1: 16. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Suillus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): "*Boletus luridus* Schaeff." — SCOPE. Introduced with two certain species and a doubtful one.

Suillus S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. 1: 646. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: an ancient name used by the Romans for what was apparently *Boletus edulis* Bull. ex Fr. and perhaps, other boletes; of a swine. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Suillus luteus* S. F. Gray = *B. luteus* L. ex Fr.—The species Gray called *Suillus luteus* he published with a *description* faithfully translated from that of *Boletus annulatus* Pers., Syn. Fung. 503. 1801; the latter name in its turn is nothing but a name change (or error) for *Boletus annularius* Bull.; and hence both *Suillus*

[19] Murrill thought 1860 the date of publication.

luteus S. F. Gray and *B. annulatus* Pers. must be considered typonyms of *B. annularius* Bull. The *name*, Gray derived from "*Boletus luteus*, Schaeff. Fung. 114 . . . not of Linnaeus," but this does not alter the above conclusion about the typication of *Suillus luteus*. The point is of accademic interest only as long as *B. annularius* is placed in the synonymy of *B. luteus*, as is currently done. — SOME HISTORICAL NOTES:

". . . *Suillus* is an ancient name. According to Pliny (77 A.D.), the Romans used it (not in a generic sense, of course) for what was apparently *Boletus edulis* and perhaps other *Boleti*, while calling *Amanita caesarea* by the name *Boletus*. Caesalpino (1583) and Porta (1592) used both words in the same manner. Micheli (1729) first used *Suillus* as a generic name, applying it to the *Boleti* and using *Boletus* as did Tournefort (1694 & 1700) for the morels and phalloids.[20] He was followed by Haller (1742, and in part, 1768), Müller (1763) and Adanson (1763); Vaillant (1727) and Battarra (1755) used *Boletus* but not *Suillus*.

"Up to this point, a majority had referred to the *Boleti* under the name *Suillus*, the notable exception being: Tournefort, who used *Fungus* for at least a part, and his follower, Vaillant; Dillenius (1719) who first used *Boletus* for this group[21] and some of the Polypores; and Battarra, who coined a new name, *Ceriomyces*[22] It was Linnaeus (1753) who definitely turned the tide away from *Suillus*, for which he substituted *Boletus* in Dillenius' sense, just as he changed the senses of all the names used by the Romans. . . . Poiret (1806) resurrected Micheli's name *Suillus*[23] for the *Boleti* and one polyporaceous species, *betulinus*. . . . Then Gray . . restricter *Suillus* to one group of the *Boleti*. . . ."— Snell (*in* Mycologia 34: 404-405. 1942).

PRE-LINNEAN NAME: *Suillus* Mich., Nov. Pl. Gen. 126 *pls. 68, 69*. 1729. —An inclusive genus of boletes; 25 species. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Suillus* [Mich.] Adans., Fam. Pl. 2: 10. 1763; Haller, Hist. Stirp. indig. Helv. inch. 2: 29. 1768.—Adanson referred to "Mich. *t. 68, 69*." Although Adanson's nomenclatorial system is neither Tournefortian nor Linnean, his name would have been considered validly published if the starting-point date 1753 for these fungi had not been changed. — SCOPE. Gray divided the boletes (that is, *Suillus* Mich.) over three genera: *Suillus, Pinuzza* S. F. Gray, and *Leccinum* S. F. Gray. The first two comprised one, collared, species each; the remaining, ringless, species went into the third genus. The only (British) species of *Suillus* treated by Gray is *Boletus luteus* "Schaeff." — REMARKS. Gray cited Micheli as the author of the name *Suillus* he adopted. Since the one species he retained under it is at least very doubtfully acceptable as the type of *Suillus* Mich., his emendation should rather be considered a misapplication which by the introduction of the later starting-point for these fungi acquired the status of a 'new'

[20] See also under *Boletus* L. ex Fr.
[21] See under *Boletus* L. ex Fr.
[22] See under *Ceriomyces* Murrill.
[23] Snell appended Poiret's two pertinent paragraphs *verbatim* in a footnote.

genus; hence it is preferable to drop the author's citation Micheli in connection with *Suillus* S. F. Gray. — J. S. Presl (Vseobecny Rostlinopsis 2: 1917. 1846) also had a genus *Suillus* for veiled species. I have not seen the book, but Dr. A. Pilát kindly informs me that three species were well described in Czech and he has been good enough to translate the Czech generic description for me: "Pileus et hymenophor ut in *Boletis*. Velum in iuventute partem pilei inferioren claudit, dein rumpens et reliquiae eius in pilei margine vel in stipite relinquens." Species: *Suillus annulatus* (Pers.) J. S. Presl (with *Boletus luteus* L. as a synonym) and *S. flavidus* (Fr. ex Fr.) J. S. Presl, in the first section; and *S. aurantiacus* (Bull. ex Hook.) J. S. Presl. in a second section. — HOMONYMS: *Suillus* P. Karst. (1882) and *Suillus* [Haller] O.K. (1898). — TYPONYMS: *Cricunopus* P. Karst. (1881), *Viscipellis* Quél. (1886), *Peplopus* (Quél.) Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry (1887), *Ixocomus* Quél. (1888), and *Boletopsis* P. Henn. (1898; preoccupied). And compare *Boletus* L. ex Fr. (1821).

Suillus [Haller] O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. 3 (2): 534. 1898. — ETYMOLOGY: see under *Suillus* S. F. Gray. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Suillus fulvus inferne ex flavo virescens* Haller (with as a synonym, *Suillus esculentus crassus superne fulvus, inferne initio albidus, deinde e flavo subvirescens, pediculo ventricoso, & supernae pilei parti concolore* Mich., Nov. Pl. Gen. 127. 1729).—Von Haller's species is evidently a mixture of several representatives of *Boletus sensu stricto* of modern authors, and it may be interpreted in agreement with the first synonym he cited, the phrase of which doubtlessly inspired his own. In my opinion Micheli's species belongs to the group of *Boletus edulis* Bull. ex Fr., although I find it difficult to suggest to which of the many forms (or related species) it may be referred. — PRE-LINNEAN NAME: "*Suillus* Hall. 1742 En. Helv.: 29—31, ‚Micheli'."—O. Kuntze (*l.c.*). Introduced as a scientific name for the boletes by Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 126. 1729) and applied by Von Haller (Enum. meth. Stirp. Helv. indig. 29. 1742) in the same sense. The latter author "führte 1742 unter *Suillus* 11 Arten auf, die, soweit ich sie identificiren konnte, alle zu *Boletus* auct. rec. gehören."—O. Kuntze (*l.c.*). Because he took 1735 as the starting-point date for generic names, Kuntze considered the first use after that date the one validly published. — SCOPE & VALID PUBLICATION. Kuntze did not give a description and the valid publication of the name by him depends exclusively on the citation of the pre-Linnean name *Suillus* Haller as quoted above.[24] He took up the name in a somewhat restricted sense, as equivalent to *Boletus* as compiled by Saccardo, but

[24] See also footnote 17.

with the exclusion of the ringed species, *Boletopsis* P. Henn., q.v., for which he 'restored' *Solenia* Hill, q.v. — TYPIFICATION. Kuntze did not select a type species. — Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 10. 1909), following a nomenclatorial code with 1753 as the general starting-point date (not 1735 as in Kuntze's code), ascribed the first valid publication of *Suillus* to Poiret ("Encycl. Méth. Bot. 7: 496. 1806"), indicating "*Suillus annulatus* Poir." (*Boletus annulatus* Pers.) as the type species.[25] He overlooked previous uses from between 1753 and 1806 (see under *Suillus* S. F. Gray) or apparently looked upon them as 'hyponyms.'[26] — In any case Murrill's indication can not be transferred to *Suillus* as published by Kuntze, since the latter, simultaneously with the publication of the name, excluded the ringed species. This fact also prevents an attempt to identify Kuntze's name with *Suillus* S. F. Gray, q.v. — The selection of the type species of *Suillus* P. Karst., q.v., viz., *Boletus cyanescens* Bull. ex Fr., is out of order, too, since it seems not to be represented among Von Haller's species. — It is suggested to select Von Haller's first species which includes one of the boletes described by Micheli, the author to whom he ascribed the generic name. — REMARK. It is difficult to interpret *Suillus* O.K. as a monadelphous homonym of *Suillus* S. F. Gray because both names go back to *Suillus* Mich., a name from before the introduction of the binomial system. — HOMONYMS: *Suillus* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Suillus* P. Karst. (1882; preoccupied). — TYPONYMS. Compare *Tubiporus* Paul. ex P. Karst. (1881), *Dictyopus* Quél. (1886), *Oedipus* Bataille (1908), and *Ceriomyces* Murrill (1909; preoccupied); and compare also *Boletus* L. ex Fr. (1821).

Suillus P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 37: v, 1. 1882. — ETYMOLOGY: see under *Suillus* S. F. Gray. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus cyanescens* Bull. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for three species and one more added with a note of interrogation; first species, *Boletus cyanescens*, one of the others being *Boletus castaneus* Bull. (non Fr. 1821). — TYPIFICATION. The first author to indicate a type species for *Suillus* "Karst." was Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 14. 1909), who listed *Boletus cyanescens* Bull. This species has also been chosen by Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 231. 1945). — I know of no valid reason to alter this indication and to replace it by *Boletus castaneus* as was done by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 347. 1931). Since both the generic subdivision of *Gyroporus* Quél., q.v., to which *B. cyanescens* belongs, and *Suillus* P. Karst, are nothing but

---

[25] Poiret did not definitely accept the genus (" . . . les suilles . . . ne sont qu'une division des bolets & . . . ne peuvent pas en être séparé comme genre").

[26] Also published in 1806, "*Suillus*, Hall." by Roussel, Fl. Calvados, 2e Ed., 69. Compare also De Jussieu (Gen. Pl. 4. 1789), etc.

one and the same already previously introduced taxon, viz., *Boletus* trib. *Cariosi* Fr. (as delimited in Fries, Hym. europ. 517. 1874), it is logical to typify all names given to this taxon by the same species. This should be *B. cyanescens,* indicated first for both the generic names involved. This also applies to *Coelopus* Bataille. — REMARK. Karsten did not indicate any previous author as the originator of the name: he ascribed it to himself. — ISONYM: *Lactisuillus* O.K. (1898), q.v., a provisional name. — HOMONYMS: *Suillus* S. F. Gray (1821; Boletaceae) and *Suillus* [Haller] O.K (1898; Boletaceae). — TYPONYMS: *Coelopus* Bataille (1908) and *Leucoconius* (Reichenb.) ex Beck (1923). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Trachypus Bataille *in* Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Doubs No. 15: 12 (reprint pagination). 1908. — ETYMOLOGY: τραχύς, rough; πούς, foot. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus rufus* Schaeff.—Bataille conceived this species broadly, apparently inclusive of *Boletus versipellis* Fr. and *B. aurantiacus* Bull. He ascribed the name to Schaeffer (cf. Bataille, *op. cit.* p. 27) and I select Schaeffer's plate as representing the basis of his conception of *B. rufus.* — SCOPE. Introduced with four species described in a key: *Boletus scaber* Bull. ex Fr., *B. rufus, B. umbrinus* Pers., and *B. rugosus* Fr. — TYPIFICATION. Choice should be made between *B. scaber* and *B. rufus.* On the correct identity of the first of these species wars are waging. — Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 110. 1947) proposed *Boletus rufus* as the type species — Kühner (*in* Bull. Soc. Nat. Oyonnax 2: 44. 1948) considered *Boletus scaber* the type species; it was also listed by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 95. 1953). — REMARKS. "*Trachypus* Batt. ex Snell (1941)" as listed by Ainsworth & Bisby, Dict. Fungi 300. 1943, is an error. — HOMONYM: *Trachypus* Reinw. & Hornsch. (1829; Musci frondosi). — TYPONYMS. Accepting *Boletus rufus,* the earliest choice, as the correct type species, *Trachypus* becomes a typonym of *Krombholzia* P. Karst. (1881) and *Krombholziella* Maire (1937), both names based on *Boletus versipellis* Fr.; and if *B. rufus* is broadly conceived, also of *Leccinum* S. F. Gray (1821), which is based on *B. aurantiacus* Bull. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier typonym.

Tramaporus Kalchbr.—See under *Boletinus* Kalchbr.

Tubiporus Paul. ex P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. 3 (No. 9): 16. 1881. — Etymology: tubus, tube; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus edulis* Bull. ex Fr. — PROTONYM: *Tubiporus* Paul., Iconogr. Champ. *pl. 166bis-183bis.* 1812-35.— Some general remarks on Paulet's generic names will be given on a later occasion. *Tubiporus* was not validly

published by Paulet. It being a nomen nudum, I would not even consider it a devalidated name. It was for the first time validly published when Karsten took it up. Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 10. 1909) indicated "*Tubiporus annulatus* (Bull.) Paul." = *Boletus annularius* Bull. = *Boletus annulatus* Pers. = *Boletus luteus* L. ex Fr. as the type species of *Tubiporus* Paul.; he considered *Tubiporus* P. Karst. a different genus. — SCOPE. When reintroduced by Karsten, four species were mentioned as examples, *B. edulis* being the first enumerated. — TYPIFICATION. *Boletus edulis* has been considered the type species of Karsten's generic name by those authors who indicated one: Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 140. 1909), Maire [*in* Publ. Inst. bot., Barcelona 3 (4): 40, 41. 1937], and Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 20. 1947). — REMARK. This name has been used by some authors, in the place of *Boletus* Fr., for a restricted genus including *B. edulis*; some of these authors consider *B. luteus* L. ex Fr. the correct type species of *Boletus* L. ex Fr., q.v., while others, like Romagnesi (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 66: 56, 62. 1950), want to drop the name *Boletus* for a restricted genus and to substitute for it *Tubiporus* (or *Dictyopus*). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Tubisporus*"; O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. 3 (2): 534. 1898 (in synonymy).— Evidently an unintentional error. — TYPONYMS: *Dictyopus* Quél. (1886), *Oedipus* Bataille (1908), and *Ceriomyces* Murrill (1909; preoccupied); and compare *Boletus* L. ex Fr. (1821) and *Suillus* [Haller] O.K. (1898; preoccupied).

Tubisporus.—See *Tubiporus*.

Tylophilus.—See *Tylopilus*.

Tylopilus P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. 3 (No. 9): 16. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: τύλος, knot; πῖλος, cap. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus felleus* Bull. ex Fr., — VARIANT SPELLINGS: "*Tylophilus*"; Clem. & Shear, Gen. Fungi 347. 1931 (in synonymy).—An unintentional error. — "*Tylopus*"; A. A. Pears., Brit. Bol. 19. 1950 (in synonymy). —An error: compare page 3. — TYPONYM: *Rhodoporus* Quél. ex Bataille (1908). And compare *Rhodobolites* Beck (1923).

Tylopus.—See *Tylopilus*.

Uloporus Quél., Ench. Fung. 162. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: οὖλος, crisped; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus lividus* Bull. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with three species and one entered with a mark of interrogation; the first species is *Boletus placidus* Bonord. In Quélet's circumscription the name was 'superfluous' for he cited the earlier name *Gyrodon* Opat., q.v., as a synonym. However, it might well be

accepted that he considered *B. lividus*, which he knew well, as the leading species rather than *Boletus sistotrema* Fr. (the type species of *Gyrodon*). — TYPIFICATION. *Boletus lividus* is the obvious choice; it was already selected as the type species by Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 243. 1945). The indication of "*U. volvatus* (Pers.) - or *U. placidus* (Bon.)" by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 97. 1953) must be rejected.

Veloporus "Quél." ex Killerm. *in* Engl. & Pr., Nat. PflFam., 2. Aufl., 6: 205. 1928 (in synonymy). — Killermann cited "*Veloporus* Quél., Fl. myc. 1888" as a generic synonym of *Boletus* Dill.; the name is accordingly registered by Ainsworth & Bisby (Dict. Fung. 316. 1943). As far as I am aware Quélet never published either a genus of this name or an infrageneric group with '*Veloporus*' in its name. Perhaps an error for *Ixonomus* subgen. *Peplopus* Quél. (1886) = *Peplopus* (Quél.) Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry (1887)?

Versipellis Quél., Ench. Fung. 157. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: changeable in appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus subtomentosus* L. ex Fr. — SCOPE. This generic name (which has no relation whatever with *Boletus* sect. *Versipelles* Fr.) was introduced for a combination of two Friesian groups: (i) *Boletus* sect. *Subtomentosi* Fr. (Epicr. 415. 1838; Hym. europ. 501. 1874; *Boletus* stirps *B. subtomentosi* Fr., Summa Veg. Scand. 2: 316. 1849) and (ii) *Boletus* sect. *Subpruinosi* Fr. (Hym. europ. 504. 1874). Although Quélet dit not explicitly state the connection between his genus and these two sections, it does nevertheless undeniably exist. His two subdivisions "a. Pileus villosus, raro demum glabratus" and "b. Pileus glaber, saepius pruinosus" correspond with those of Fries's as to both their characters and contents! Fries's characterization of '*Subtomentosi*' contains, "Pileus . . . villosus, raro demum glabratus," and of '*Subpruinosi,*' "Pileus glaber, sed saepius pruinosus." — TYPIFICATION. The type species of the Friesian section names, which automatically must also become the leading species of Quélet's subdivisions, are, in my opinion, the only really eligible ones. The first section name, '*Subtomentosi,*' has to be typified, without reserves, by *Boletus subtomentosus*, a conclusion already expressed by Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 297. 1945), when he indicated that species as the type. The other section did not include a species bearing a name from which the section epithet was derived. Of its species, one (*Boletus pruinosus* Fr.) was known to Fries from living material, one (*B. parasiticus* Bull. ex Fr.) from dried specimens, and the others only from descriptions and figures. It will, therefore, be easily understood why *Boletus pruinosus* has been proposed as the type species of '*Subpruinosi*'

by Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 18: 147. 1949).[27] From these two species thus singled out and considered eligible for Quélet's generic name, Donk (*l.c.*) selected *B. subtomentosus*. — Perhaps the first indication of a type species for *Versipellis* is one by Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 140. 1909), who adhered to the first-species rule and thus took Quélet's first species, *Boletus variegatus* Sw. ex Fr. He was followed by Maire [*in* Publ. Inst. bot., Barcelona 3 (4) : 41. 1937] and by Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 258. 1945). The latter author proposed to follow Murrill, apparently in order to get rid of the name *Versipellis* as a rival of *Xerocomus*, because *B. variegatus* is at present no longer considered representative of *'Subtomentosi'* and seems better classed in *Ixocomus* Quél. = *Suillus* S. F. Gray emend. Snell. As will pointed out below, this species is not eligible! — NOMEN REJICIENDUM (proposed). *Versipellis* and *Xerocomus* Quél., q.v., are two names for one taxon. Of the two, *Versipellis* is the earlier and, thus, the correct one. However, it has not been taken up, and *Xerocomus* is now generally used in its place by those authors who divide the Friesian genus *Boletus* into several smaller ones. An additional motive for the rejection of *Versipellis* has been emphasized by Snell (*in* Mycologia 34: 407. 1942) : confusion is to be feared with *Boletus* sect. *Versipelles* Fr., which covers quite a different group of boletes. Rejection of *Versipellis* Quél. as a nomen ambiguum (Art. 75) as suggested by Snell and afterwards Rogers (*in* Farlowia 4: 35. 1950), is definitely out of the question because *Versipellis* Quél. and *Boletus* sect. *Versipelles* Fr. are undoubtedly two quite different names (rather than one name "used with different meanings") ; however, confusion has not as yet occurred at all, and it seems doubtful if it ever will, or, if so, would really "become a long-persistent source of error." If one wants to retain *Xerocomus*, the only solution is to conserve *Xerocomus* against *Versipellis*. This proposal was moved by Donk (*l.c.*).[28] Singer is against it:

[27] Singer (*in* Amer. Midl. Nat. 37: 38. 1947; *in* Lilloa 22: 678. 1951) indicated Fries's first species as the type, *Boletus barlae* Fr., one of the species Fries knew only from literature.

[28] The Secretary of the Special Committee for Fungi (*in* Taxon 2: 29. 1953; *in* Mycologia 45: 314. 1953) disposed of this proposal as one that aimed at conservation of a name that would be retained without conservation. When Donk protested, the Secretary asked the Committee to decide whether or not the proposal was to be admitted to a vote and later reported (Circular to Members) as the majority opinion that it was not. This procedure is not acceptable, simply because there is as yet no way to force upon the public a debatable lectotype, except under certain circumstances by the simultaneous adoption of a proposal for conservation. In my opinion the correct application of the Code leads to a different lectotype from the one backed by the Secretary. If the proposal is rejected in the future, I shall feel obliged to take up the name *Versipellis*, if I feel inclined to accept the corresponding genus, unless, of cource, convincing arguments to the contrary are published; there are others who agree in this respect. The present discussion has already been published in a mimeographed paper (Donk, Proposal Conserv. *Xerocomus* v. *Versipellis*. 4 pp. 1953; and *in* Taxon 3: 25. 1954, proposal without discussion). The proposal still stands.

"Da kein formeller Grund vorliegt, *Versipellis* als basonym von *Xerocomus* zu betrachten, liegt auch kein Grund vor, die Lectotypenart von *Xerocomus* auf *Versipellis* zu übertragen. Folglich liegt weiterhin kein Grund vor, die erste Wahl eines Lcetotypus (Singer 1945[29]) zu ignorieren wie es Donk tut, und statt dessen einen neuen Lectotypus zu wählen und die Gattung *Xerocomus* als nomen conservandum vorzuschlagen . . .. Ich wünsche aber zu unterstreichen, dass mit meiner absolut legitimen Typifizierung (*V. variegata*) *Versipellis* ein vom praktischen Standpunkt harmloses Synonym von *Xerocomus*[30] wird . . .. "—Singer (*in* Schweiz. Z. Pilzk. 29: 216. 1951; see also p. 226).

Singer's 'absolutely legitimate typification' is in reality one easy to dispose of. (i) To one with a very formal attitude there may perhaps be no ground to consider *Versipellis* basinym of *Xerocomus*, but this does not necessarily imply that considerations of logic, moral obligations, and the spirit of the Code must be ignored. I doubt whether even Singer would go so far as to maintain that Quélet had two *different* genera in mind, which was the point I raised. If he believes *Xerocomus* as conceived by Quélet to be the group centering around *X. subtomentosus* (to use his own words), one would certainly like to know his reasons why the same should not also hold good for *Versipellis*! Quélet retained the genus, he only changed its name. (ii) Specialists (including Singer) agree at present that *B. variegatus* is rather a member of *Ixocomus* = *Suillus*. Does Singer really believe that this species might have stood foremost in Quélet's mind when he coined the name *Versipellis*? The original generic description contains "Pileus villosus vel pruinosus," and stated nothing else about the surface of the cap. *Boletus variegatus* ("Pileo . . . squamulis fasciculato-pilosus . . . adsperso") does not agree with the generic description and, therefore, must be ruled out as eligible. (iii) Quélet himself did not act in such a way as to justify Singer's view. Only two years later (Quélet, Fl. mycol. France 414. 1888) he transferred *B. variegatus*, with "Peridium . . . humide, *lubrifié* . . .,"[31] to *Ixocomus*. Thus this species had already been excluded long before anybody chose it as the type. For this reason also it appears difficult to maintain it, if one does not want to ignore the regulations for the determination of types. (iv) For my reasons to prefer *B. subtomentosus* even regardless of the two foregoing considerations, see above under "Typification." (v) The abuse of the type-method to dispose of a name by juggling cannot be too severely condemned. Every validly published name, even the most embarrassing one, ought to have a fair trial. — TYPONYMS: *Xerocomus* Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry (1887; rather, isonym) and *Xerocomopsis* I. Reichert (1940).

[29] Already indicated before by Murrill; see above.
[30] Apparently *Ixocomus* = *Suillus* is meant.
[31] Italics as in the original!

Viscipellis Quél., Ench. Fung. 155. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: viscum, birdlime; pellis, skin. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (same as selected for basinym): *Boletus luteus* L. ex Fr. — BASINYM: *Boletus* sect. *Viscipelles* Fr., Epicr. 409. 1838; Hym. europ. 496. 1874 = *Boletus* stirps *Viscipellis* Fr., Summa Veg. Scand. 2: 315. 1849.—The avowed basinym: Quélet called the genus "*Viscipellis*, Fr." — SCOPE. Quélet did not change the limits of Fries's group as he found it dealt with in "Hymenomycetes europaei." — TYPIFICATION. The type species accepted here hardly needs comment. *Boletus luteus* was already proposed by Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 258. 1945). — *Boletus sphaerocephalus* Barla should be rejected. It is Quélet's first species and was indicated as the type by Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 10. 1909), but is not among Fries's original species of the basinym, it being described at a later date than 1838. — ISONYM. *Ixocomus* Quél. (1888) may be regarded as a mere, and superfluous, name change. — TYPONYMS: *Suillus* S. F. Gray (1821), *Cricunopus* P. Karst. (1881), *Peplopus* (Quél.) Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry (1887), and *Boletopsis* P. Henn. (1898; preoccupied). And compare *Boletus* L. ex Fr.

Volvoboletus P. Henn. *in* Engl. & Pr., Nat. PflFam. 1 (1**): 196. 1898. — ETYMOLOGY: volva, wrapper; the genus *Boletus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus volvatus* Pers.—Compare the following note:

"Ce *B. volvatus* ne paraît pas être un [*Ixocomus*] *viscidus*, dont l'anneau serait resté, accidentellement, comme volve à la base du pied, ainsi que le pensait Fries (1838), ni *Amanita vaginata* parasité, dont le port est trop différent, comme le supposait Quélet (1888[32]), mais plutôt une forme tératologique de l'*Amanita gemmata*, seule espèce volvée dont une poussée vernale semble possible, en avril, dans la région du Mans (Sarthe). J'ai reçu de Chauvin, en provenance aussi de la région mancelle, une petite Amanite volvée et exannulée, mais cueillie en automne, qui appartient à l'*A. gemnata* au sens large, et qui pourrait bien être la base de ce Bolet fantôme."—Gilbert (Bolets 121-122. 1931).

REMARK. For a discussion on this genus, see Ulbrich (*in* Ber. dtsch. bot. Ges. 57: 389-396. 1939. — ISONYM: *Boletium* Clem. (1909), q.v. — STATUS. It may be assumed that *Volvoboletus* is either a nomen monstrositatis, or if the type were a parasitized fungus, a nomen confusum. In either case it would be impriorable.

Xanthoconium Sing. *in* Mycologia 36: 361. 1944. — ETYMOLOGY: *ξανθός*, yellow, blond; *κονία*, dust. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (by original

[32] Quélet (Fl. mycol. France 411. 1888): "Lusus d'*A. vaginata* dont l'hymenium est transformé par un *Hypomyces*."

designation): *Gyroporus stramineus* Murrill. — SCOPE. Introduced to accommodate two species.

Xerocomopsis I. Reichert *in* Palest. J. Bot., Rehovot Ser. 3: 229. 1940. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Xerocomus*; ὄψις, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Boletus subtomentosus* L. ex Fr. — SCOPE. This is almost the same as *Xerocomus* Quél. (1887), q.v., and practically it is an isonym of that name. Reichert was of the opinion that *Boletus impolitus* Fr. (Quélet's first species of that author's use in 1888) ought to be taken as the type of *Xerocomus*, and considering it not congeneric with the rest of *Xerocomus*, he coined the name *Xerocomopsis* for the taxon exclusive of *B. impolitus*, retaining *Xerocomus* for that one species. — TYPONYMS: *Versipellis* Quél. (1886) and *Xerocomus* Quél. apud Moug. & Ferry (1887).

Xerocomus Quél. *apud* Moug. & Ferry, Champ. *in* Louis, Départ. Vosges, Fl. Vosges 477 (109, reprint pagination). 1887[33]; Fl. mycol. France 417. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: ξηρός, dry; κόμη, hair. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus subtomentosus* L. ex Fr. — SCOPE. *Xerocomus* is a name given to exactly the same taxon as *Versipellis* Quél. (1886), q.v., and there can be no doubt that it is a mere change for the latter name, although this was not expressly stated. Why Quélet made the change is not altogether clear. (It may be noted in this connection that shortly afterwards he changed *Viscipellis* Quél. into *Ixocomus* Quél., q.v.). — TYPIFICATION. In regarding *Xerocomus* as virtually being an isonym of *Versipellis*, one may automatically accept for it the (selected) type species of the latter name, viz., *Boletus subtomentosus*, already selected for *Xerocomus* by Singer (*in* Ann. mycol. 34: 325. 1936; 40: 46. 1942; *in* Farlowia 2: 285. 1945; *in* Lilloa 22: 665. 1951).[34] — *Boletus impolitus* Fr. was indicated as the type species at an earlier date by Murrill (*in* Mycologia 1: 140. 1909). It was accepted by Gilbert (Bolets 95. 1931), Maire [*in* Publ. Inst. bot., Barcelona 3 (4): 41. 1937], and I. Reichert (*in* Palest. J. Bot., Rehovot Ser. 3: 225. 1940), it being the first species in 1888.[35] It is untenable. When introducing the generic name (1887!) Quélet listed *B. impolitus* not as a distinct species, but (erroneously) as a variety under *B. fragrans* Vitt. — Gilbert, when still retaining *B. impolitus* as the type species, tentatively suggested Quélet's fifth species of 1888:

---

[33] See also note on this publication under *Gymnopus* Quél.

[34] See also under *Versipellis!*

[35] The publication of *Xerocomus* in 1887 has been universally overlooked; the first species there is *Boletus variegatus* Sw. ex Fr., which species should have been adopted by those who followed the 'first-species rule.'

"En créant ce genre, Quélet n'a pas désigné l'espèce type. Il faut donc adopter la première du genre, soit le *X. impolitus*; elle n'est pas encore parfaitement connue; il eut mieux valu prendre le *X. chrysenteron*."—Gilbert (Bolets 95. 1931).

As far as I am aware Kühner (*in* Bull. Soc. Nat. Oyonnax 2: 44. 1948) was the first definitely to adopt *Boletus chrysenteron* Bull. ex Fr., after *B. subtomentosus* had already been selected by Singer (*l.c.*). — REMARK. Believing *Boletus impolitus* worthy of an isolated position, Reichert (*l.c.*) restricted *Xerocomus* to this one species and introduced the name *Xerocomopsis* I. Reichart for the remainder of *Xerocomus*: "[*Boletus subtomentosus*] according to the rules of nomenclature cannot occupy [the position of type of *Xerocomus*] because it was mentioned by Quélet after *B. impolitus*." Singer (*in* Farlowia 2: 285, footnote. 1945) already criticised Reichert's conclusions. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Aerocomus*"; Léon March., Enum. méth, Mycogr. 203. 1896.—Apparently an error. — TYPONYMS: *Versipellis* Quél. (1886; rather, basinym) and *Xerocomopsis* I. Reichert (1940). — NOMEN CONSERVANDUM (proposed). See under *Versipellis*.

Reprinted from Taxon 5: 69—80, 95—115. 1956.

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR HYMENOMYCETES—V *)

"Hydnaceae"

by

M. A. Donk (The Hague)

SUMMARY

1. The present paper deals with the "Hydnaceae," which are defined in a purely artificial manner.

2. The typification of *Grandinia* Fr., *Hydnum* L. ex Fr., *Irpex* Fr., *Martella* Endl., *Odontia* S. F. Gray, *Radulum* Fr., *Xylodon* (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray, and several other names, is discussed at some length and the conclusions submitted for consideration.

3. *Xylodon* (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray is reduced to a synonym of *Odontia* S. F. Gray.

4. *Cerophora* Rafin. and *Priapus* Rafin. are considered synonymous with *Lycoperdon* Pers. (Gastromycetes), and *Radulum Fr.* with *Eutypa* Tul. or *Xenotype* Petr. (Sphaeriales).

INTRODUCTION.—This is the fifth of a series of papers designed as an annotated nomenclatural enumeration of all generic names that have been proposed for Hymenomycetes. For some general remarks on the series and for the explanation of some nomenclatural terms the reader is referred to Part I (Donk *in* Reinwardtia **1**: 199-203. 1951). I am very much indebted to Dr C. E. B. Bremekamp for linguistic improvements.

DEFINITION.—The family "Hydnaceae" is here taken in the purely artificial circumscription in which it appears even in some modern text-books. Sterile hyphal pegs protruding beyond the hymenium are not taken as "teeth."

Excepted are genera characterized either by typically flattened ('irpicoid') teeth or by folds. The former will be treated in a subsequent Part dealing with the "Polyporaceae"; however, *Irpex* Fr. and *Xylodon* (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray have been included in the present paper because their nomenclature is mixed up with that of *Radulum* Fr. and *Odontia* Pers. ex S. F. Gray. The genera that are provided with radiating folds, and that sometimes too have been included in the "Hydnaceae," will be treated with the "Thelephoraceae." Also included in the latter family will be some generic names with strictly resupinate type species that have been placed in the genus *Peniophora* Cooke; they are *Kneiffia* Fr. and its isonyms, *Scopuloides* (Mass.) Höhn. & L., and, in their wake, *Grandiniella* P. Karst. The genera with toothed hymenophore and cruciate-septate basidia will, of course, be treated with the Tremellaceae.

ALPHABETICAL ENUMERATION

Acia P. Karst *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 42. 1879. — ETYMOLOGY: ἀκίς, point. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hydnum fuscoatrum* Fr. ex Fr. — SCOPE. The original genus equals *Hydnum* trib. *Resupinati* Fr. (Fries, Hym. europ. 612. 1874), although this was not especially indicated. As examples Karsten listed 31 species, among which are a number of extra-European ones. First species, *H. fuscoatrum*. — TYPIFICATION. The following reasons support the selection of *Hydnum fuscoatrum* as the type species. (i) A few years after the publication of the generic name the author himself [Karsten *in* Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9): 20. 1881; *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6**: 15, 16. 1881] distributed the Finnish species included in the original list [1]) over two genera: *Acia*, restricted, and "*Hydnum* (Linn.)" ["Hydnum (Linn.) Quél."]. Only two species of the former genus were mentioned: *H. fuscoatrum*

*) Part I ("Cyphellaceae") was published *in* Reinwardtia **1**: 199-220. 1951; Part II (Hymenolichenes), *in* Reinwardtia **2**: 435-440. 1954; Part III ("Clavariaceae"), *in* Reinwardtia **2**: 441-493. 1954; Part IV (Boletaceae), *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 275-313. 1955.

[1]) It often seems reasonable to look for the type species in the first place among those species known to the author by personal experience; it can be assumed that Karsten knew most of the species reported from Finland from his own collections.

and "*Ac. ferruginea* (Pers.)."[2]) Restricted in this manner, *Acia* corresponds to *Hydnum* trib. *Resupinati* group * Aculeis fuscis, ferrugineis (Fries, *l.c.*). (ii). Still later on the second of the two species was placed by Karsten in a subgenus of its own, *H. fuscoatrum* being retained as the only typical Finnish member of the genus.[3]) Finally, that second species (or at least a specimen referred to it by Karsten) was removed from the genus by Patouillard who published a new monotypic genus for it, viz. *Asterodon* Pat.[4]) q.v. (iii) *Acia* was taken up by Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 69. 1900) who thoroughly emended the genus : *H. fuscoatrum* was not only placed first, but it was also the only species common to those listed by him and those enumerated in 1879 by Karsten. It is, therefore, entirely probable that Patouillard regarded this species as the type, although he did not expressly indicate it as such. (iv) *H. fuscoatrum* was indicated as the type species by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 444, 447. 1902) because it was Karsten's first species. Donk (*in* Meded. Nederl. mycol. Ver. **18-20** : 150. 1931) and Ragab (*in* Mycologia **43** : 458. 1951) accepted this species, which was also made the type of *Mycoacia* Donk, a name introduced to replace *Acia* emend. Pat. — Homonym: *Acia* Schreb. (1791; Rosaceae). — Typonym: *Mycoacia* Donk (1931), q.v. — Status. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

"*Aciella*." — Laurila [*in* Ann. bot. Soc. zool.-bot. fenn. Vanamo **10** (4) : 15. 1939] cited "*Aciella tomentosa* (Schrad.) Karst." as a synonym under *Asterodon ferruginosus* Pat. "*Aciella*" was never used as a correct generic name, but there exists a taxon *Acia* subgen. *Aciella* P. Karst. (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48** : 362. 1889) with one species, viz. "*Ac*[*ia*] *tomentosa* (Schrad.) Karst."; see also under *Acia*. — Not *Aciella* Tiegh. (1894; Loranthaceae). — For 'typonyms,' see under *Asterodon*.

Acontia Hill, General nat. Hist. **2** : 41. 1751[5]) (pre-Linnean name). — This was Hill's name for the stipitate hydnums. He referred to it three species of which he supplied descriptions (of the first moreover a figure) and seven species mentioned by name only. His first species, *Acontia album crassum* Hill is here selected as the type. I would identify it with *Hydnum repandum* L. ex Fr. (*Hydnum imbricatum* L. ex Fr. is not one of the three described species.) This choice makes typonyms of *Bidonia* Adans. (1763; devalidated name), *Echinus* Haller (1768; devalidated name), *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. (Jan. 1, 1821), *Dentinum* S. F. Gray (Nov.? 1821), *Tyrodon* P. Karst. (1881), and *Hypothele* Paul. ex Banker (1904; not validly published). — Leman [*in* Dict. Sci. nat. **1** (Suppl.) : 46. 1816] recorded the name (with description), but remarked that Adanson already had recognized the genus, as *Bidonia*, and finally he refers for further information to "*Hydnum* et Erinace," which implies that he did not accept the genus and the name taxonomically. I am not aware of *Acontia* having been validly published after 1821.

Actinostroma Klotzsch.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Amaurodon J. Schroet., *in* Cohn, Krypt.-Fl. Schles. **3** (1) : 461. 1888. — Etymology: ἀμαυρός, dark, obscure; ὀδών, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (only original species): *Hydnum viride* (A. & S.) ex Fr. sensu J. Schroet.—Schroeter described the spores as

---

2) This species will be found among the original ones as "*Acia ferruginosa* (Schrad.) Karst." Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37** : 112. 1882) considered the names synonymous. Still later (1889) he called it "*Ac*[*ia*] *tomentosa* (Schrad.) Karst."

3) *Acia* subgen. *Eu-Acia* P. Karst. (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48** : 361. 1889), with "*Ac. castanea* (Alb. et Schw.) Karst." 1882 = *H. fuscoatrum*; the other part being called *Acia* subgen. *Aciella* P. Karst. (p. 362), with "*Ac*[*ia*] *tomentosa* (Schrad.) Karst."

4) *Asterodon ferruginosus* Pat. (type at Paris!) is a 'new species': the name is apparently not a recombination, although it was based on a collection by Karsten from Finland labelled "*Hydnum ferruginosum* Fr."

5) Of this work editions exist dating from after 1753. Pfeiffer (Nomencl. bot. **1** : 31. 1873) cited *Acontia* as published in 1762; O. Kuntze (Rev. Gen. Pl. **1** : cxxx. 1891) discussed an edition of 1773. It would seem that these editions are on the whole identical with the first one, though with certain pages reprinted. I regard the unaltered pages in later editions as published on the original date. See also Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **2** : 492-493. 1954) for similar cases.

having a membrane "im frischen Zustande dunkel violett, (so dass das Sporenpulver schwarz erscheinen muss), verblassend," and smooth. This indicates a fungus widely different from the modern interpretation of *Hydnum viride* (with aculeolate spores). Rogers & Jackson (*in* Farlowia **1** : 277. 1943) suggested that it is probably identical with *Hypochnus mustialaensis* P. Karst. and *Coniophora cyanospora* D. P. Rog. rather than *Caldesiella viridis* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Pat. [6] — Remark. Compare *Hydnopsis* (J. Schroet.) Rea.

Asterodon Pat. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **10** : 130. 1894. — Etymology: *ἀστηρ*, *-έρος* a star; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (only original species): *Asterodon ferruginosus* Pat. ("n. sp."; *"ferruginosum"*). [7] — Typonyms: *Hydnochaete* Peck (1897; preoccupied) and *Hynochaetella* Sacc. (1898), and compare *"Aciella."*

Auricula Lloyd.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Auriscalpium S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1** : 650. 1821. — Etymology: auriscalpium, ear-pick. Gender: n. — Type species (only original species): *Auriscalpium vulgare* S. F. Gray.—An isonym of *Hydnum auriscalpium* L. — Remark. O. Kuntze [Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2) : 446. 1898], erroneously assuming that *H. auriscalpium* and *Arrhenia auriscalpium* (Fr.) Fr. were the same species, substituted *Auriscalpium* S. F. Gray for *Arrhenia* Fr. — Typonymous homonym: *Auriscalpium* P. Karst *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5** : 41. 1879. — Independently introduced for three species of which *H. auriscalpium* L. ex Fr. is the first, and equalling *Hydnum* trib. *Pleuropus* Fr. (Fries, Hym. europ. 606. 1874). Karsten, too, renamed his first species *Auriscalpium vulgare* [P. Karst.]. This species was indicated as the type by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 443, 447. 1902). — Isonym. *Pleurodon* P. Karst. (1881) could be taken as an isonym of *Auriscalpium* P. Karst.

---

[6]) Already many years ago Romell identified in his copy of Schroeter's book (now in the possession of Herbarium Bogoriense) Schroeter's fungus with *Hypochnus mustialaensis*. For a recent redescription of Karsten's species, as *Coniophora mustialaensis* (P. Karst.) Mass., see Wakefield (*in* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. **35** : 43. 1952).

[7]) See also foot-note 4 to *Acia*.

Bankera Coker & Beers *ex* Pouzar *in* Česká Mykol. **9** : 95. 1955. — Etymology: H. J. Banker. Gender: f. — Type species (by original designation): *Hydnum fuligineoalbum* Schmidt *ex* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1** : 400. 1821. — Protonym: *Bankera* Coker & Beers, Stip. Hydn. east. U.S. 33. 1951.—Not validly published: no accompanying Latin description. The authors included only one species, which was indicated as the type. — Scope. Coker & Beers admitted but one species, Pouzar included three. — Remark. Pouzar supplied the Latin description that made *Bankera* a validly published name.

Beccaria "Mass." — See *Beccariella*.
Beccariella Ces. — See "Thelephoraceae."

Beenakia Reid *in* Kew Bull. **1955** : 635, 1956. — Etymology: Beenak, Victoria, Australia. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species): *Beenakia dacostae* Reid.

Bidona Adans., Fam. Pl. **2** : 5. 1763 (devalidated name). — Introduced for centrally stalked hydnums with orbicular pileus; *Fungus erinaceus* Vaill. (Bot. paris. 58. 1723) and *Erinaceus spp.* Mich. (Nov. Pl. Gen. *pl. 72 fs. 2, 3, 8.* 1729) were especially indicated and may be taken as representative. They correspond to *Hydnum repandum* L. ex Fr. as to Vaillant's species and as to two of those depicted by Micheli, viz. figure 3 and perhaps also figure 2 (pale form); and to *Hydnum auriscalpium* L. ex Fr. as to Micheli's figure 8 (illustrated with orbicular, central pileus). — Vaillant's species is here selected as the type. — Typonyms: *Erinaceus* Dill. (1719; pre-Linnean), *Echinus* Haller (1768; devalidated name), *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. (1821), *Dentinum* S. F. Gray (1821), *Tyrodon* P. Karst. (1881), and *Hypothele* Paul. ex Banker (1904; not validly published). — Adanson is a non-Linnean author, but his name would have been regarded as validly published if the starting-point date 1753 had not been changed to 1821 for these fungi. — After 1821 the name has not been taken up and validly re-published.

Bonia Pat.—See Tremellaceae.

Boninohydnum S. Ito & Imai *in* Trans. Sapporo nat. Hist. Soc. **16** : 127. 1940. — Etymology: Bonin Islands; the genus *Hydnum*. Gender: n. — Type species (only original species): *Boninohydnum pini* S. Ito & Imai.

Caldesiella Sacc., Fungi ital. *f. 125.* May 1877; *in* Michelia **1** : 6. June 1, 1877. — Etymology: L. Caldesi. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species): *Caldesiella italica* Sacc.—Now often regarded as conspecific with *Hydnum ferruginosum* Fr.; Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 472. 1928) treated it as *Caldesiella ferruginosa* subsp. *italica* (Sacc.) Bourd. & G. — Valid publication. According to the dates given for the two publications cited above, this generic name was first validly published under a figure, without description but with some accompanying indications including measurements (name of a monotypic genus based on a new species). There is also a reference ("Fungi Ven. Ser. VI p. 6") to the second (later) publication which gives both a generic and a specific description. — Remark. Originally interpreted as a genus of Gastromycetes, the teeth being called peridia. — Typonyms. The following names are based on *Caldesiella ferruginosa* (Fr.) Sacc.: *Odontium* Rafin. (1817; devalidated name), *Hydnopsis* (J. Schroet.) Rea (1909), and *Odontia* Pers. ex Banker (1929. preoccupied), and compare also *Phaeodon* J. Schroet. (1888). — Nomen rejiciendum. To be rejected in favour of *Tomentella* Pat. ("Thelephoraceae"), q.v., if the two genera are combined.

Calodon P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9) : 20. Jan. 1, 1881; *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6** : 16. 1881. — Etymology: *καλός*, beautiful; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum suaveolens* Scop. ex Fr. — Protonym: *Calodon* Quél. *apud* Cooke & Quél., Clav. Hym. 196. 1878.—Published, together with some more new names in Hydnaceae, as follows:

[Page 195:]

Gen. XXXI. Hydnum, Linn.

Trib. i. Mesopus (Genus *Sarcodon*, Q.) [8]

Sect. 1. Carnosi

[Species: [9] *H. imbricatum*, Linn.; *H. squamosum*, Schaeff.; *H. fragilis*, Fr.; *H. repandum*, Linn.; *H. fuligineo-album*, Schmidt; etc.]

[Page 196:]

Sect. 2. Lignosi (Genus *Calodon*, Q.)

[Species: *H. suaveolens*, Scop.; *H. aurantiacum*, A. & S.; *H. velutinum*, Fr.; *H. nigrum*, Fr.; *H. graveolens*, Fr.; etc.]

Trib. ii. Pleuropus (Genus *Pleurodon*, Q.)

[Species: *H. occidentale*, Paul; *H. luteolum*, Fr.; *H. auriscalpium*, Linn.; etc.]

Trib. iii. Merisma (Genus *Dryodon*, Q.)

[Species: *H. umbellatum*, March.; *H. coralloides*, Scop.; *H. erinaceum*, Bull.; *H. Schiedermayeri*, Henfl.; etc.]

Trib. iv. Apus (Genus *Pleurodon*, Q.)

[Species: *H. corrugatum*, Fr.; *H. cirrhatum*, Pers.; *H. diversidens*, Fr.; *H. fulgens*, Fr.; *H. septentrionale*, Fr.; *H. geogenium*, Fr.; *H. strigosum*, Sw.; *H. hirtum*, Fr.; *H. ochraceum*, Pers.; etc.]

Trib. v. Resupinati (Genus *Hydnum*, Q.)

[With resupinate species.]

[Basinym: *Hydnellum* P. Karst. (1879), q.v. —And see below.]

Scope & typification. The year after the publication of Quélet's names and still unaware of their existence, Karsten (*in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5** : 40-42. 1879), too, divided *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. into a number of genera; from the examples one would conclude that he continued to apply the name *Hydnum* to *Hydnum* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Carnosa* Fr. (Fries, Hym. europ. 598. 1874); for *Hydnum* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Lignosa* Fr. (p. 602) he introduced *Hydnellum* P. Karst.; for *Hydnum* trib. *Pleuropus* Fr. (p. 606), *Auriscalpium* P. Karst.; for *Hydnum* trib. *Merisma* Fr. (p. 607), *Friesites* P. Karst.; for *Hydnum* trib. *Apus* Fr. (p. 609), *Creolophus* P. Karst. plus *Gloiodon* P. Karst.; and for *Hydnum* trib. *Rosupinati* Fr. (p. 612), *Acia* P. Karst. Thus,

Hydnum em. P. Karst. equals *Sarcodon*,
Hydnellum equals *Calodon*,
Auriscalpium equals *Pleurodon* pr. p.,
Friesites equals *Dryodon*,
Creolophus + *Gloiodon* equals *Pleurodon* pr. p., and
Acia equals *Hydnum* em. Quél.

However, in 1881 Karsten dropped most of his own names to replace them by Quélet's,

---

[8] "(Genus *Sarcodon*, Q.)" is obviously misplaced; it should come after "Sect. 1. Carnosi."

[9] The names and author's citations are as in the original.

but he kept to his own delimitations of 1879, except (i) in the case of *Hydnum* em. P. Karst. = *Sarcodon*, from which the group of *Hydnum repandum* was segregated to become a distinct genus, viz. *Tyrodon* P. Karst., (ii) in the case of *Hydnellum* = *Calodon*, from which the genus *Phellodon* was segregated, and (iii) in the case of *Acia*, q.v., which was further divided into *Acia, sensu stricto*, and "*Hydnum*."

Thus, he substituted his

Hydnum em. P. Karst. by *Sarcodon* pr. p. + *Tyrodon*,
Hydnellum by *Calodon* pr. p. + *Phellodon*,
Auriscalpium by *Pleurodon* pr. p.
Friesites by *Dryodon*, and
Acia by *Hydnum* em. Quél. pr. p. + *Acia*.

In this way *Sarcodon* became validly published rather as a name change for *Hydnum* em. P. Karst.; *Calodon*, as a name change for *Hydnellum; Pleurodon*, as a name change for *Auriscalpium;* and *Dryodon*, as a name change for *Friesites*. When we accept this view the species to be selected as the types of *Calodon, Pleurodon*, and *Dryodon*, as validly published by Karsten, should rather be the same as the types of their basinyms *Hydnellum, Auriscalpium*, and *Friesites* respectively. In the case of *Calodon* this type is *Hydnum suaveolens*. This species was indicated for *Calodon* Quél. ex P. Karst. by Banker (*in* Mem. Torrey bot. Cl. **12** : 103. 1906); for *Calodon* Quél. by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 441, 447. 1902), Miller (*in* Mycologia **25** : 301. 1933), and Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 63. 1943]; and for "*Calodon* [Quél. in: Cooke & Quél. . . ., subgen.] Karst." by Maire (*in* Int. Rules bot. Nomencl., 3 Ausg., 123. 1935). — VALID PUBLICATION. The date of valid publication of *Calodon* and the other generic names of Hydnaceae proposed by Quélet has become a matter of dispute. Without denying Quélet's intention to publish his names as generic ones in Cooke & Quélet's "Clavis" (1878), one seems nevertheless bound by the present Code to regard them as not validly published at that occasion; for discussions see Banker (*in* Mem. Torrey bot. Cl. **12** : 102. 1906), Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17** : 183-184. 1941; **18** : 151-152. 1949), Maire [*in* Publ. Inst. bot. Barcelona **3** (4) : 35. 1937], and Rogers (*in* Farlowia **3** : 435. 1949). The author who validly published *Calodon, Sarcodon, Pleurodon*, and *Dryodon* was Karsten, as cited above. — The names *Sarcodon, Calodon*, and *Dryodon* were once more validly published by Quélet himself (Ench. Fung. 188, 190, 192. 1886). At that occasion *Pleurodon* was replaced by *Leptodon* Quél., q.v., and *Hydnum* em. Quél. by "*Odontia*, Pers." — REMARK. Maire's proposal [*in* Int. Rules bot. Nomencl., 3. Ausg., 123. 1935; *in* Publ. Inst. bot., Barcelona **3** (4): 35. 1937] to conserve *Calodon* against *Hydnellum* was recommended for rejection by Donk (*ll.cc.*) and Rogers (*l.c.*). Rejected by ballot by the Special Committee for Fungi (cf. *in* Taxon **2** : 31. 1953; *in* Mycologia **45** : 320. 1953). — TYPONYM. Compare *Phaeodon* J. Schroet. (1888).

Cerenella Murrill.—See Polyporaceae.

[*Cerophora* Rafin. *in* Medic. Repos., New York, 2nd Hex., **5** : 355. 1808; Préc. Découv. somiol. 49. 1814 [French translation *in* J. Bot. (red. Soc. Bot.), Paris **2** : 176. 1809, with some errors]; Anal. Nat. ou Tab. Univ. 211. 1815 (nomen). — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Cerophora clavata* Rafin. — It is often very difficult to establish what fungi Rafinesque described: in this case a solution seems possible. The descriptions run:

> ". . . a fine new genus, akin to hydnum, but the fructification is in horn-like terminal papillae. Found in different states [of the U.S.A.]."—Rafinesque (*l.c.*, 1808).[10])
>
> "Péride sessile ou stipité, simple ou ramifié, fructification supérieure en forme de petites cornes ou pointes solides. — Obs. Ce G. ne diffère presque pas de l'*Hydnum* que par ses pointes dures et lâches."—Rafinesque (*l.c.*, 1814).

In 1808 seven species were mentioned, but only by their epithets; the first three are, "*clavata, globosa, pyriformis, . . .*" In 1814 two were briefly described: *C. clavata* Rafin. ("Péride en massue cylindracée obtuse, sessile, base nue. Dans le N. Jersey") and *C. capitata* Rafin. ("Stipité, péride sphérique entièrement couvert de pointes. Dans le N. Jersey"). Unpublished figures of six species are preserved in the library of the New York Botanical Garden: compare also Gerard (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **12** : 37. 1885).

---

10) In the French translation one finds: ". . . fructification semblable à de petites cornes terminées par des papilles," which is an erroneous rendering.

With this combined information in hand and by selecting the first species (one of the two ever to be described),[11] *Cerophora clavata,* as the type species, the generic name may be reduced to a synonym of *Lycoperdon* Pers. (starting-point date, 1801), rather than of *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. (*s. lat.*) and *Hericium* Pers. ex S. F. Gray, as has previously been done (*cf.* Endlicher, Gen. Pl. 39. 1836; Ench. bot. 21. 1841). This conclusion would make *Cerophora* a validly published name. The fruit-body proper of the first three species is clavate, globose, and pyriform; what Rafinesque called the fructification are superficial papillae, either prominent at the apex of the fruit-body or distributed all over its surface. — *Hectocerus* Rafin. (*in* Medic. Repos., New York, 2nd Hex., **3** : 423. 1806) is a nomen nudum and a precursor of *Cerophora.* Rafinesque mentioned five specific epithets (all nomina nuda) as examples; these coincide with the first five mentioned under *Cerophora* in 1808. The identity of the two generic names is thus established beyond reasonable doubt.]

Climacodon P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9) : 20. Jan. 1, 1881; *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6** : 15. 1881. — Etymology: *κλῖμαξ, —ακος,* ladder; *ὀδών,* tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (only original species): *Hydnum septentrionale* Fr.

Corneohydnum Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **7** : 1321. 1924 (nomen nudum). — A perfect nomen nudum introduced in the form *"Corneohydnum anomalum,"* this binomial being all that was published on the genus. — Stevenson & Cash (*in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 65. 1936) reproduced Lloyd's unpublished note concerning this fungus but merely as a record, without the intention validly to publish the generic name.

Crelophus.—See *Creolophus.*

Creolophus P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5** : 41. 1879. — Etymology: *κρέας,* meat; *λόφος,* tuft of hair, crest. Gender: n. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum corrugatum* Fr.—I take this species as closely related to, or conspecific with, *Hydnum cirrhatum* Pers. — Scope. Evidently the genus as originally introduced corresponds exactly to *Hydnum* trib. *Apus* Fr. group * Pileo carnoso, molli (Fries, Hym. europ. 609. 1874). Four examples were listed by Karsten; the first is *Hydnum corrugatum.* — Typification. The first species was taken as the type by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 444, 447. 1902; *in* Mycologia **5** : 293. 1913). — Variant spelling: *"Crelophus"*; W. B. Cooke, Gen. Homobas. 26. 1953 (incidental mention).

Cymatoderma Jungh.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Cystidiodrendron J. Rick *in* Lilloa **9** :218. 1943. — Etymology: *κύστις,* cystidium, *δένδρον,* tree. Gender: n. — Type species (only original species): *Cystidiodendron fimbriatum* J. Rick.

Dacrina Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 172. 1825. — Etymology: *δακρύω,* I weep. Gender: f. — Type species (by original designation): *Hydnum sudans* A. & S. ex Fr. — Homonym: *Dacrina* Fr., Syst. mycol. **3** (2) : 291. 1832. — Remarks. When Fries introduced the generic name *Dacrina* for the first time he stated, *"Hydn. sudans* A. S. pro typo habeo," and the generic description would seem to confirm this statement. Yet, in the starting-point book we find *Hydnum sudans* treated as a species of *Thelebolus* Tode ex Fr. (Fries, Elench. **2** : 51. 1828) (see also under *Dacryobolus*), whereas *Dacrina* re-appears with a much changed generic description and with two quite different species [Fries, Syst. mycol. **3** (2) : 291. 1832]. Although Fries in this latter instance misapplied the name *Dacrina* (in the "Systema," vol. 3, he refers to "Syst. Orb. Veg. 1, p. 172"!), it must be retained as published at that occasion (Art. 23 f), that is, with *Dacrina fusco-olivacea* Fr. (*Dematium velutinum* A. & S.) as the type species. — Compare Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 68. 1900) who has a taxon *Grandinia* sect. *Dacrina* (Fr.) Pat.: "A cette section se rapporte le *Dacryobolus sudans* A. & S. . . ." — Typonym: *Dacryobolus* Fr. ex Fr. (1849) and *Gloeocystidium* P. Karst. (1889). — Status. Impriorable on account of *Dacrina* Fr. 1832!

Dacryobolus Fr. *ex* Fr., Summa Veg Scand. **2** : 404. 1849. — Etymology: *δάκρυον,* tear; *βόλος,* throw, clod. Gender: m. — Type species (only original species): *Thelebolus sudans* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Fr. (Elench. **2** : 51. 1828) = *Hydnum sudans* A. & S. ex Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1** : 425. 1821). — Protonym:

---

11) "Entièrement couvert de pointes" of *Cerophora capitata* Rafin. does not agree with the generic description.

Dacrybolus Fr., Elench. **2** : 51. 1828.—On this occasion introduced as a provisional name: following the treatment of the species as *Thelebolus sudans*, the following observation is found, "Utique peculiare genus (*Dacrybolus* [!], cum *Dacrina* analogum) facile constituit; cum vere praecedenti evidenter valde affinis, novorum generum timidus, sub hoc aptissime collocavi." As the name was not definitely accepted, it must be regarded as not validly published in 1828. — Remarks. When validly published in 1849, included in the Pyrenomycetes! — Clements & Shear (Gen. Fung. 346. 1931) suggested a non-original species as the type, viz. *Hydnum udum* Fr. — Typonyms: *Dacrina* Fr. (1825; impriorable; not *Dacrina* Fr. 1832) and *Gloeocystidium* P. Karst. (1889).

Dentinium.—See *Dentinum*.

Dentinum S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1** : 650. 1821. — Etymology: dentino, an Italian fungus-name. Gender: n. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum repandum* L. — Scope. Introduced with *Hydnum repandum* and *H. rufescens* Pers., in this order. The two are closely related if not conspecific. — Typification. The first species was indicated as the type by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 447. 1902), Miller *in* Mycologia **25** : 298. 1933), and Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 58. 1943]. — Remark. Gray indicated Micheli as the author of the generic name. This is incorrect: Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 132. 1729) merely mentioned under his *Erinaceus esculentus, albus, crassus* (*pl. 72 f. 2*) as Italian names for this fungus (perhaps a whitish form of *Hydnum repandum*): "Steccherino, o dentino bianco, buono"; and under his *Erinaceus esculentus, pallide luteus* (*pl. 72 f. 3*) (= *Hydnum repandum*): "Steccherino, o dentino dorato, buono." — Variant spelling: "*Dentinium*"; Ainsworth & Bisby, Dict. Fungi 84. 1943 (incidental mention). — Typonyms: *Erinaceus* Dill. (1719; pre-Linnean), *Bidona* Adans. (1763; devalidated name), *Echinus* Haller (1768; devalidated name), *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. (1821), *Tyrodon* P. Karst. (1881), and *Hypothele* Paul. ex Banker (1904; not validly published).

Dicarphus Rafin. *in* Medic. Repos., New York, 2nd Hex., **3** : 423. 1806 (nomen nudum); **5** : 355. 1808 (devalidated name) [French translation of description *in* J. Bot. (red. Soc. Bot.), Paris **2** : 176. 1809]; Specch. Sci. **1** : 194. 1814. — Type species (only original species): *Dicarphus rubens* Rafin.—The original description (1808) of this species runs:

> "*Dicarphus, (rubens)* very curious mushroom, with two sorts of fructifications, something like a thelephora uppermost, and hydnum underneath. I found it in Penn. [= Pennsylvania, U.S.A.]."

The description of 1814 contains some additional information. — It looks as if the spelling 'Dicarpus' was intended (*cf.* ". . . like a thelephora uppermost, and hydnum underneath"). — Listed, but not definitely taxonomically accepted, by Reichenbach (Consp. Regni veg. 15. 1828; incidental mention).

"*Diopogon.*" — This name appears in an observation to *Thelephora* subg. *Himantia* Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1** : 450. 1821) which reads as follows: "Evolutionis historia, contextus & fructificationis processus absque ascis cum *Diopogone* (*Hydnis* ascis in floccis solutis), *Polysticto, Porothelio* omnino conveniunt." On page 6 of the same work a group is found that is called *Hydnum* [sub-gen.] *Diopogon*, "Asci nulli, in floccos soluti." ('*Polystictus*' and '*Porotheleum*' [12]) are in the same work also subgenera, of *Polyporus* Fr.) In the special treatment of *Hydnum* in the main body of the text this subgeneric name does not re-appear.

Donkia Pilát *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **52** : 328. 1936. — Etymology: M. A. Donk. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species): *Hydnum pulcherrimum* Berk. & C.

Dryodon P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9) : 19. Jan. 1, 1881; *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6** : 15. 1881. — Etymology: δρυς, —νός, oak, tree; ὀδών, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. ex Fr. — Protonym: *Dryodon* Quél. *apud* Cooke & Quél., Clav. Hym. 198. 1878.— Given to the same group previously called *Hydnum* trib. *Merisma* Fr. (Fries, Hym. europ. 607. 1874), for the first part of which ("* Ramosissima") Karsten established in the next year *Friesites* P. Karst. Not validly published: see under *Calodon!* — [Basinym: *Friesites* P. Karst. (1879), q.v. —] Scope & typification. When Karsten became aware of

12) Compare Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **1** : 218. 1951).

the existence of the name *Dryodon* Quél., he treated it as if it were validly published and, because it was of an earlier date, abandoned his own name *Friesites*, q.v., in favour if it. Therefore, *Dryodon* owes its valid publication to its use by Karsten (see under *Calodon*) and it appears as if we are fully entitled to interpret *Dryodon* P. Karst. (but not *Dryodon* Quél.) as a mere name change of *Friesites*. Whether we accept this point or not, *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. ex Fr. becomes the type species of *Dryodon* in any case. When publishing *Dryodon*, Karsten mentioned as an example a single Finnish species, viz. "*Dr. coralloides* (Scop.)" and its subspecies "*Dr. caput ursi* (Fr.)."[13] — Before Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 442. 1902) realized that *Dryodon* Quélet (1878) was not validly published, he regarded it as a "genus founded on *Hydnum umbellatum* March. with seven other species . . ."[14] — REMARK. The author who coined the generic name, supplied himself several years later a description: *Dryodon* Quél., Ench. Fung. 192. 1886. This name, according to W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 32. 1953), has the same type species[15] as Karsten's re-publication. It can be valued at most as a homotypous homonym. — TYPONYM: *Hericium* Pers. ex S. F. Gray (1821; not *Hericium* Fr. 1825).

Echin-agaricus Hall. (1742).—See Tremellaceae.

Echinodontium Ell. & Ev.—See "Polyporaceae."

Echinus Haller, Hist. Stirp. ind. Helv. inch. **2** : 152. 1768 (devalidated name). — A name used for the great majority of the hydnums and introduced in spite of the pre-existing names *Erinaceus* Dill.[16] (1717), used also by Micheli, and *Hydnum* L. (1753), which were both mentioned as synonyms. — I select Von Haller's species no. 2325 = *Hydnum repandum* L. ex Fr. as the type. — Typonyms: *Erinaceus* Dill. (1719; pre-Linnean); *Bidonia* Adans. (1763; devalidated name), *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. (1821), *Dentinum* S. F. Gray (1821), *Tyrodon* P. Karst. (1881), and *Hypothele* Paul. ex Banker (1904; not validly published). — Although Von Haller was a non-Linnean author, this name would have been validly published if the nomenclatural starting-point date for the group had remained 1753.

Erinaceus Dill., Cat. Pl. ca Gissam nasc. 188 & App. 74. 1719. — Type species (only original species): *Erinaceus coloris pallide lutei* Dill. = *Hydnum repandum* L. ex Fr. — This name was not taken up after 1753. See also under *Hydnum*. It was taken up by Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 132. 1729) and some later authors.

Etheirodon Banker *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 441. 1902 — ETYMOLOGY: ἔθειρα, mane; ὀδών, tooth. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (same as of basinym and by original designation): *Hydnum fimbriatum* (Pers.) ex Fr. — BASINYM: *Odontia* Fr. (1835), q.v. — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. Published with a reference to the basinym but without accompanying description; hence the scope is that of the basinym. — REMARK. A name change introduced because of the pre-existence of *Odontia* Pers. (1794).

Friesites P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5** : 41. 1879 — ETYMOLOGY: E. M. Fries. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. ex Fr.[17] — SCOPE. Introduced for *Hydnum* trib. *Merisma* Fr. group * Ramosissima (Fries, Hym. europ. 607. 1874). As examples the two species recorded for Finland were mentioned: *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. ex Fr. and *H. caput-ursi* Fr., in this order — TYPIFICATION. According to the

---

13) In the "Revue mycologique" the second species is not preceded by a number, which has to be taken as indicating that Karsten did not accept it as an independant species; in the other publication of the name *Dryodon* in the same year, *Dryodon caput-ursi* is quite unambigously listed as a subspecies of *D. coralloides*.

14) *Hydnum umbellatum* "March." = *H. umbellatum* Fr., Epicr. 511. 1838 (name change) = *Hydnum ramosissimum* March. & Court. *ex* Fr., Syst. mycol. **3** (Index) : 101. 1832 ("Marchand"). Perhaps no *Hydnum* at all.

15) Not Quélet's first species (*H. umbellatum*) but *H. coralloides!*

16) This name was originally adopted by Von Haller (Enum. meth. Stirp. Helv. ind. **1** : 31. 1742) for the genus, with "*Hydna* Linnaei n. 807" as a synonym, although in a somewhat restricted sense because of the exclusion of *Echin-agaricus* Haller.

17) The remark of W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 36. 1953) that this species "= *Thelephora granulosa* Fr." is due to an error.

code followed by him, Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 447. 1902) indicated the first species as the type. This is fully acceptable, as *Hydnum coralloides* is the best known species. — [Isonym: *Dryodon* I. Karst. (1881), q.v. —] TYPONYM: *Hericium* Pers. ex S. F. Gray (1821; not *Hericium* Fr. 1825).

Gleoradulum "McGinty": Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **5** (Rad.) : 9. 1917 (not validly published); see also: Stevenson & Cash *in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35 : 66. 1936 (as *Gloeoradulum*). — For some general remarks on the not validly published McGinty names, see Part I of the present series (Donk *in* Reinwardtia **1** : 205. 1951). — Name coined in connection with *Radulum hydnoideum* (Schw.) Lloyd.

Gloeocystidium P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48** : 429. 1889 (German translation of Swedish description *in* Bot. Cbl. **43** : 384. 1890). — ETYMOLOGY: γλοιός, any sticky substance; κύστις, bladder. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Grandinia exsudans* P. Karst. = *Odontia sudans* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Bres. — SCOPE. Introduced for two species: *Grandinia exsudans* P. Karst., and *Gloeocystidium guttuliferum* P. Karst. = *Peniophora guttulifera* (P. Karst.) Sacc. — TYPIFICATION. *Gloeocystidium* 'Karst.' as interpreted by modern authors has not a single species in common with the original genus. W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 39. 1953) selected the first species as the type. — The suggestion made by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 345. 1931) to choose *Corticium lactescens* Berk. as the type is not acceptable since it is not one of the original species. — REMARK. This generic name has been misapplied by Von Höhnel & Litschauer and by later authors: for their taxon the name *Gloeocystidiellum* Donk ("Thelephoraceae") was introduced. — TYPONYMS: *Dacrina* Fr. (1825; impriorable; not *Dacrina* Fr. 1832) and *Dacryobolus* Fr. (1849).

Gloeoradulum.—See *Gleoradulum.*

Gloiodon P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5** : 42. 1879. — ETYMOLOGY: γλοιός, any sticky substance; ὀδών, tooth. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hydnum strigosum* Sw. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for *Hydnum* trib. *Apus* Fr. group *** Simplicia, pileo coriaceo l. suberoso (Fries, Hym. europ. 611. 1874), although this was not expressly stated. Three species were mentioned, *Hydnum strigosum*, *H. hirtum* Fr., and *H. pudorinum* Fr.; the first species was the only one that was seen by the author. — TYPIFICATION. The first species was regarded as the type by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 443, 447. 1902; *in* Mycologia **2** : 10. 1910), Miller (*in* Mycologia **25** : 296. 1933), and Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 8. 1943]. Shortly after the establishment of the genus, Karsten himself (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37** : 110. 1822) restricted the generic name to that species, placing *H. pudorinum* in *Climacodon* P. Karst. (p. 97). The only Finnish species is *H. strigosum*, the only species mentioned in some of his publications dedicated to the Finnish hydnums [Karsten *in* Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9) : 20. 1881; *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6** : 16. 1881]. — VARIANT SPELLING "*Gloeodon*"; P. Henn. *in* Engl. & Pr., Nat. PflFam. **1** (1**) : 144. 1898 (as a synonym). — ISONYM: *Sclerodon* P. Karst. (1889), q.v. — TYPONYM: *Leaia* Banker (1906).

Grammothele Berk. & C.—See "Polyporaceae."

Grandinia Fr., Epicr. 527. 1838. — ETYMOLOGY: grando, hail. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Grandinia granulosa* (Fr., non Pers.) Fr.[18]) = ?—See below.

VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. Fries used the name for the first time in his "Epicrisis," although on account of a reference directly following it one would get the impression that he did publish it before. However, when one looks up the work he cited one will not find the name *Grandinia*, but instead of it *Gausapia*, and it is clear from the similarity between the two generic descriptions and the species mentioned that it was indeed *Gausapia* to which Fries referred. To demonstrate this point I will quote the two pertinent descriptions:

---

[18]) The listing of the type species as *Hydnum granulosum* "Secr." by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 41. 1953) is an error. At the end of his description, Fries noted, "*Hydn. granulosa* Secr.," which is the mention in synonym of a group of species, viz. "*Hydnum* . . . Fam. VI. Hydnes renversés. (H. resupinata.) . . . ***) Pointes arrondies, granuliformes" of Secretan (Mycogr. suisse **2** : 534. 1833), a group of five species among which no species of the name of 'Hydnum granulosum' is to be found!

"*Gausapia.* Hymenium granulosum; granulis confertis regularibus globosis 1. hemisphaericis obtusis apiceve excavatis.

"Genus maxime naturale, undique licet species suas colligens: 1) subiculo contiguo glabro: *Th. granulosa* (nunc Hydneum Persoonio), *Th. papillosa* Elench., *Hydnum crustosum* P. etc. 2) subiculo laxo tomentoso vix cohaerente: *Th. bombycina* Elench., *pedicellata* Schw., *Hydnum rubrum* P. etc."—Fries (Gen. Hym. 13. 1836).

"*Grandinia.* (Gen. Hym.) Hymenium amphigenum, contiguum, ceraceum, papilloso-verrucosum aut potius granulosum, granulis globosis hemisphaericisve integris obtusis apiceve excavatis, confertis regularibus glabris persistentibus. Crustaceae, effusae, molles, *Thelephoris* ob papillas aequales persistentes male adscriptae, ab *Hydnis* infantilibus caute separandae. *Hydn. granulosa* Secr."—Fries (Epicr. 527. 1838).

So one may be tempted to regard *Grandinia* as a mere name change for *Gausapia,* and to take the type of the latter name, *Thelephora pedicellata* Schw., also as the type of *Grandinia.* But that species was not definitely included; compare: "*Gausapiae,* subgen. *Thelephorae,* h.l. forsan inseri possent" at the end of his treatment of *Grandinia* (Fries, Epicr. 528).

Typification. Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 441, 447. 1902), and Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 10. 1943] regarded Fries's first species, *Grandinia polycocca* Fr., as the type. A modern redescription of this species has not yet been published. However, this indication is hardly acceptable, since Fries would have taken his idea of the genus rather from the six remaining species which are Swedish, than from this exotic one which he knew only from fragments sent to him by Montagne.

Consulting Fries's "Summa vegetabilium Scandinaviae" (**2** : 329. 1849), we find the name of one of these six Swedish species, viz. *Grandinia granulosa* Fr., printed in italics, which means that it is the most widely spread one in Sweden; it is the second of those enumerated in 1838. In my opinion it was this fungus that stood foremost in Fries's mind when he established the genus. With *G. mucida,* and *G. ocellata* in a slightly less degree, it agrees very closely with the generic description of 1849 ("Hymenium ceraceum, contiguum, granulosum"[19]). It was suggested as the type by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fung. 346. 1931). For these reasons, *G. granulosa* is clearly preferable.

Because of material in Fries's herbarium *G. granulosa* has currently been identified with a fungus provided with typical dichophyses, which is now referred to the genus *Asterostromella* Höhn. & L. = *Vararia* P. Karst.,[20]) but I seriously question whether this may be regarded as the true *G. granulosa* of Fries, for "ceracea . . ., adglutinata" (Fries Epicr. 527) of the specific description and "Hymenium . . . ceraceum . . ." of the generic description (Epicr. 527; Summa **2** : 329) do not apply to it! Rogers & Jackson (*in* Farlowia **1** : 283-284. 1943) already proposed that *Thelephora (Grandinia) granulosa* "Pers." ex Fr. be considered a nomen dubium.[21]) It is doubtful whether we will ever know what Fries's species really represents; I certainly can not accept its inclusion in *Vararia.* In selecting *G. granulosa* the generic name *Grandinia* at the same time will become a nomen dubium to many mycologists.

Is it possible to save the name *Grandinia* for the genus to which it is now often applied, for instance by Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 406. 1928)? In that case the substitute type would have to be selected from the remaining original species of *Grandinia* 1838. They are:[22])

(1) *G. mucida* (Fr.) Fr.[23]) = ?[24])

---

[19]) Each one of these words re-appears in the original description of *G. granulosa.*

[20]) See also Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 396. 1928).

[21]) Persoon's type (!) was identified by Bourdot with *Peniophora setigera* (Fr.) Höhn. & L., a species now sometimes referred to *Odontia* "Fr."—and not to *Grandinia.*

[22]) With the exception of *G. polycocca* Mont. apud Fr., which is already disposed of above. Interpretations according to Bourdot & Galzin (*l.c.*).

[23]) Not *Thelephora mucida* Pers.!

[24]) Under *Gloeocystidium convolvens* (P. Karst.) Bourd. & G., Bourdot & Galzin (*op. cit.* p. 254) remark: "M. Bresadola soupçonne cette espèce d'être le *Grandinia mucida* Fr." The latter must not be confused with *Hydnum mucidum* Pers. = *Radulum mucidum* (Pers.) Bourd. & G.

(2) *G. ocellata* Fr. = *Corticium lividum* (Pers. ex Fr.) Fr. [25])
(3) *G. agardhii* (Fr.) Fr. = *Odontia sudans* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Bres.
(4) *G. papillosa* (Fr.) Fr. = *Odontia papillosa* (Fr) P. Karst., and
(5) *G. crustosa* (Pers. ex Fr.) Fr. = *Odontia crustosa* (Pers. ex Fr.) P. Karst.

As one will readily see from this list no other species can be chosen in order to save *Grandinia* "Fr." sensu Bourd. & G. To select one of the species (3)—(5) in order to substitute the name *Grandinia* for *Odontia* "Fr." sensu Bourd. & G. (*op. cit.* p. 419; non *Odontia* S. F. Gray 1821 [26]) would merely add to the confusion, and is therefore not at all advisable!

Remark. Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 445. 1902) listed a genus *Grandinia* J. Schroet. [*in* Cohn, Krypt.-Fl. Schles. **3** (1) : 450. 1888], "based on *Odontia crustosa* Pers. with *G. alutacea*." There is little reason to doubt that Schroeter applied Fries's name: he merely forgot to mention the author. — Status. With *G. granulosa* as the type species, *Grandinia* will become to many authors a nomen dubium and consequently imprioriorable.

Grandinella.—See *Grandiniella*.

Grandiniella P. Karst.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Grandiniochaete J. Rick *in* Ann. mycol. **38** : 59. 1940. — Etymology: the genus *Grandinia*; χαίτη, hair. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species): *Grandiniochaete latecontexta* J. Rick ("*late contextum*").

Grandinioides Banker.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Gyrodontium Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 117. 1900. — Etymology: γῦρος, ring; ὀδών, —όντος, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum henningsii* Bres. — Scope. Introduced for two species, *Hydnum henningsii* and *Hydnum melastomae* Pat., mentioned in this order. Both species, of which material is in Patouillard's collection in the Farlow Herbarium, were known to the author when he established the genus. — Typification. Patouillard's two species are about equally eligible, but may not be congeneric. It would have been wise to postpone the selection of the type species until both would have been restudied. However, W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 42. 1953) already applied the first-species rule and listed *H. henningsii* as the type.

[*Hectocerus* Rafin.—See *Cerophora* Rafin.]

Hemidiscia Lázaro.—See "Polyporaceae."

Hericium Pers. *ex* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1** : 652. 1821. — Etymology: (h)ericius, hedgehog. Gender: n. — Type species (only original species): *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. — Devalidated name: *Hericium* Pers. *in* Neues Mag. Bot. **1** : 109. 1794 (= Tent. 29. 1797).—Introduced with a single species, *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. There seems to be no evident nomenclatural relation between *Hericium* Pers. and *Hericius* Juss. (Gen. Pl. 4. 1789), q.v. — Scope. Gray re-published the name in its original delimitation, and *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. should be accepted as the type species, as it is his only species. I assume that actually Gray raised *Hydnum* sect. *Hericium* (Pers.) Pers. (Syn. Fung. 563. 1801) to generic rank. — Remarks. The genus was considerably widened by Persoon himself [Traité Champ. comest. 250. 1818 = Verh. essb. Schwämme 162. 1822 (translation by Dierbach); Mycol. europ. **2** : 150. 1825]. In these publications he extended it first to three and then to thirteen species; in both cases *Hydnum coralloides* came first. — There is no reason to follow Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 346. 1931), who suggested as the type species of *Hericium* Pers. "1797" one of the later additions, viz. *Hydnum echinus* Scop. See for this species also under *Martella* Adans. ex O.K. — Quélet maintained *Hericium* Fr. besides *Dryodon* Quél., but called it incorrectly *Hericium* "Pers.," Persoon's name being a synonym of *Dryodon*! W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 44. 1953) recorded this error as "*Hericium* Pers. sensu Quél. Ench. Fung. 196. 1886" with *Hydnum echinus* as the type species. — Before it was ruled that Gray's "Natural arrangement" appeared after the first volume of Fries's "Systema," Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17** : 157, 169. 1941) proposed "*Hericium* Pers. ex Pers." (1825) for conservation against *Heri-*

[25]) Also placed in *Phlebia* Fr., for instance by Bresadola.

[26]) That the name *Odontia* Fr. can not be applied to the genus so called by Bourdot & Galzin, is explained elsewhere. Perhaps some authors will adopt *Odontia* S. F. Gray (1821) for this genus, when they feel bound to give up *Radulum* Fr.

cium Fr. (1825), q.v. Afterwards this proposal was withdrawn as superfluous (Donk *in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18** : 98. 1949). — Homonym: *Hericium* Fr. (1825; "Hydnaceae"), q.v. — Typonyms: *Friesites* P. Karst. (1879) and *Dryodon* P. Karst. (1881).

Hericium Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 88. 1825. — Etymology: (h)ericius, hedgehog. Gender: n. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum hystrix* (Pers.) ex Fr.—I would regard this as a mere form of some species of *Hericium* Pers. ex S. F. Gray. See also under *Martella* Adans. ex O.K. — Basinym: *Hydnum* trib. *Merisma* subtrib. *Gomphi* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1** : 409. 1821.—This subtribus included four species, in this order: *Clavaria caput-medusae* Bull. [*Hydnum caput-medusae* (Bull.) ex Fr.], *Hericium hystrix* Pers. [*Hydnum hystrix* (Pers.) ex Fr.], *Martella echinus* Scop. [*Hydnum echinus* (Scop.) ex Fr.], and *Hydnum ramaria* Fr. — Scope. Fries raised the group of 1821 unaltered to generic rank; for the species he merely referred to his "Systema." —Typification. In the course of time Fries himself removed some of the original species from the genus, transferring them to *Hydnum* trib. *Merisma* Fr.: these are *Hydnum caput-medusae* and *Hydnum ramaria*. The two species he permanently retained in *Hericium* are *Hydnum hystrix* and *Hydnum echinus*. For this reason it seems appropriate to select the type species from the latter two. As *Hydnum hystrix* was the first to be described (and figured) it would appear to be the most eligible one; Fries reported that he had seen it fresh (in contrast to the other fungus). It has been selected by Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **2** : 463. 1954). — In accordance to the first-species rule, *Hydnum caput-medusae* was taken to be the type species by Banker (*in* Mycologia **4** : 274, 275. 1902) and also by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 44. 1953). As this indication was made long after the author of the genus himself had excluded it, I believe that we are fully entitled to disregard *H. caput-medusae* as a serious rival of *Hydnum hystrix*. It represents rather an abnormal form of *Hydnum erinaceus;* compare Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 443. 1928). — Homonym: *Hericium* Pers. ex S. F. Gray (1821; "Hydnaceae"), q.v.—Originally Fries (Syst. mycol. **1** : 408. 1821) cited "*Hericium.* Pers. Comm. Clavaef. p. 28" as a synonym of *Hydnum* trib. *Merisma,* which he divided into two subtribes, (i) *'Genuini,'* with two species of which one is *Hydnum corailloides* Scop. ex Fr. (the only original species of *Hericium* Pers.), and (ii) *'Gomphi,'* later raised by him to generic rank under the present name *Hericium.* One might, therefore, suppose that his use of *Hericium* in 1825 was rather a misapplication of Persoon's name, but in 1821, when introducing *'Gomphi,'* Fries (Syst. mycol. **1** : 409) had remarked "Potius proprium genus inter Clavatos," and when definitely accepting the genus *Hericium* Fr. he added the remark: "Cum *Hericio* Pers. cujus typus *H. coralloides, Clathroides,* quae hymenio gaudent infero et vera sunt *Hydna,* non commutandum." [27]) In this way *Hericium* Fr. was clearly differentiated and dissociated from *Hericium* Pers. Later on Fries (Hym. europ. 617. 1874) called his genus "*Hericium* Pers. Comm. Clav. p. 23. p. parte. Syst. Orb. Veget. p. 88," the addition 'p. parte' obviously meaning 'exclusive of the typical group,' for he continued to exclude the typical part of *Hericium* Pers. (which in "Comm. Clavaef." had nearly the same circumscription as *Hydnum* trib. *Merisma* Fr. 1821). Although there seems to be left some room for interpreting *Hericium* Fr. as a misapplication of *Hericium* Pers., we are undoubtedly keeping on the safe side when we maintain the two names as homonyms. — Typonyms. *Martella* Adans. ex O.K. (1898; not validly published and preoccupied), q.v., has the same type species; and, perhaps, also *Medusina* Chev. (1826), q.v., *Martella* Endl. (1836; not *Martella* Adans.), q.v., and *Manina* Banker (1912; not *Manina* Adans.), q.v. — Status. *Hericium* Fr. is impriorable on account of the earlier homonym *Hericium* Pers. ex S. F. Gray.

(*To be continued*)

---

[27]) This behaviour was not unusual at that time. When a name was sunk into synonymy, it became 'free' and could be given to an other genus (it was often given to a related one).

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR HYMENOMYCETES—V*)

"Hydnaceae"

(continuation)

by

M. A. Donk (The Hague)

Hericius Juss. *ex* Lam., Tabl. encycl., Bot., Ill. Genres **3** : 494. 1823. [28]) — ETYMOLOGY: (h)ericius, hedgehog. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hydnum erinaceus* Bull. — DEVALIDATED NAME. *Hericius* Juss., Gen. Pl. 4. 1789.—De Jussieu recognized besides *Hydnum* L. a genus *Hericius* (no author's citation) for non-terrestrial species, usually with lateral stalk or sessile cap. No species were mentioned. It may be assumed that the species falling under this definition and previously described and illustrated by Bulliard (Herb. France) belong to the original species. There are sufficient indications in De Jussieu's work to accept this supposition as quite reasonable. One of the species thus included is *Hydnum erinaceus* Bull. *(op cit. pl. 34.* 1780). — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. This form (with -us) was taken up by De Lamarck, who reserved the name *Hydnum* to the stipitate and pileate species of the Linnean genus (Encycl. méth., Bot. **2** : 385. "1786" [1788]), and intended to deal with *Hericius* more extensively in a later volume of his "Encyclopédie," but did not live to carry out this intention. However, *Hericius* got in print all the same in connection with the plates (Lam., Tabl. encycl., Bot., Ill. Genres **3** : 494. 1823; Rec. Pl. Bot. Encycl. **4** : *pl. 888 below.* "1823" [before 1819]): on the plate here cited a single species is depicted, viz. *Hydnum erinaceus.* No generic des-

*) Part I ("Cyphellaceae") was published *in* Reinwardtia **1** : 199-220. 1951; Part II (Hymenolichenes), *in* Reinwardtia **2** : 435-440. 1954; Part III ("Clavariaceae"), *in* Reinwardtia **2** : 441-493. 1954; Part IV (Boleta ceae), *in* Reinwardtia **3** : 275-313. 1955.

The first part of this fifth paper was published in Taxon **5** : 69-80. 1956.

[28]) For dates of publication of De Lamarck's "Encyclopédie," *see* J. Bot., Lond. **44** : 318-320. 1906.

cription accompanies the name *Hericius* "Lamk." in the explanatory text to the plate, but there is a reference, "*Hydrum* [!] Dict.," which may be amplified, in view of the accompanying French name Urchin, as "Urchin [French name]. *Hydnum* [Name accepted by Poiret]. *Hericium* [synonym; name applied as an epithet to a subdivision of *Hydnum* farther down in the text]": Poiret *in* Lam., Encycl. méth. Bot. **8** : 197. 1808. On the cited page one will find under the entry *Hydnum* [soudivision] *Hericium* as description, "Champignons rameux; point de chapeau distinct." — Remark. When Poiret took over the "Encyclopédie," he suppressed *Hericius*, reducing it to a subdivision of *Hydnum*, thus making *Hydnum* once more the wide Linnean genus. He confirmed this disposition some years afterwards (*in* Lam., Encycl. méth., Bot., Suppl. **3** : 41. 1813): "*Hericius*. Juss. Genre que M. de Jussieu a séparé des *hydnum* de Linné. (Voyez Urchin)." This would allow us to ascribe the authorship of *Hericius*, as re-published after the nomenclatural starting-point date, to De Lamarck. The valid publication of *Hericius* by De Lamarck might be questioned on the ground that the publishing author (Poiret) did not definitely accept the genus, but as to the plates, he may, in my opinion, not be held responsible for the names on them, as the plates were engraved on copper undoubtedly long before they were published. — Homonym, variant spelling, & typonyms. If we are willing to agree that *Hericium hystrix* Pers. [*Hydnum hystrix* (Pers.) ex Fr.], *Martella echinus* Scop. [*Hydnum echinus* (Scop.) ex Fr.], and *Hydnum caput-medusae* (Bull.) Pers. [*Medusina patula* Chev.] are to be regarded as synonyms of *Hydnum erinaceus*, then *Hericium* Fr. (1825; "Hydnaceae"; preoccupied), *Medusina* Chev. (1826), *Martella* Endl. (1836; not *Martella* Adans.) become all typonyms of *Hericius* Juss. ex Lam. — When one takes into consideration Art. 82 ("When two or more generic names are so similar, and the plants so closely related, as to cause confusion, they are to be treated as variants of the same name"), *Hericius* Juss. ex Lam. must either be considered a later homonym of *Hericium* Fr. in case one refuses to identify *Hydnum hystrix* with *Hydnum erinaceus;* or merely a variant spelling of *Hericium* Fr. in case one accepts the two generic names as typonyms.

Heteroradulum "McGinty": Lloyd.—See Tremellaceae.

Hirneola Fr. 1825 (not *Hirneola* Fr. 1848). —See "Thelephoraceae."

Hydnellum P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Faun. Fl. fenn. **5** : 41. 1879. — Etymology: diminutive of *Hydnum*. Gender: n. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum suaveolens* Scop. ex Fr. — Scope. Introduced with 19 species and, although this was not especially mentioned, equalling *Hydnum* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Lignosa* (Fries, Hym. europ. 602. 1874), that is, inclusive of the later genus *Phellodon* P. Karst. First species, *Hydnum suaveolens*. — Typification. *Hydnum suaveolens* was indicated by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 443, 447. 1902; *in* Mem. Torrey bot. Cl. **12** : 149. 1906) as the type, as it is the first species mentioned; Donk (Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. **2** : 51. 1933) selected the same species. — Isonym. Later on Karsten substituted *Hydnellum* by "*Calodon* Quél." = *Calodon* P. Karst. (1881), q.v. — Homonym: *Hydnellum* P. Karst. (1896; "Hydnaceae").

Hydnellum P. Karst. *in* Hedwigia **35** : 173. 1896; Krit. Öfvers. Finl. Basidsv. Tillägg 3 : 25. 1898 (= *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **62** : 89. 1903). — Etymology: diminutive of *Hydnum*. Gender: n. — Type species (only original species): *Kneiffia subtilis* P. Karst. — Homonym: *Hydnellum* P. Karst. (1879; "Hydnaceae"). — Status. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Hydnochaete Bres. *in* Hedwigia **35** : 287. 1896. — Etymology: the genus *Hydnum*; *χαίτη* hair. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species): *Hydnochaete badia* Bres. — Homonym: *Hydnochaete* Peck (1891; "Hydnaceae").

Hydnochaete Peck *in* Rep. N. York St. Mus. **50** : 113. 1897. — Etymology: the genus *Hydnum*; *χαίτη*, hair. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species): *Hydnochaete setigera* Peck = *Asterodon ferruginosus* Pat. — Isonym: *Hydnochaetella* Sacc. (1898), q.v. — Homonym: *Hydnochaete* Bres. (1896; "Hydnaceae"). — Typonym: *Asterodon* Pat. (1894); compare "*Aciella*." — Status. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym, and, therefore, changed into *Hydnochaetella* Sacc.

Hydnochaetella Sacc., Tab. Com. Gen. Fung. 11. 1898; Syll. Fung. **14** : 11, 211. 1899. — Etymology: diminutive of *Hydnochaete*. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species of basinym): *Hydnochaete setigera* Peck = *Asterodon ferruginosus* Pat. — Basinym: *Hydnochaete* Peck (1897), q.v. —

Typonym: *Asterodon* Pat. (1894); compare "*Aciella.*"

Hydnodon Banker *in* Mycologia **5** : 297. 1913. — Etymology: the genus *Hydnum*?; ὀδών, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (only original species): *Hydnum thelephorum* Lév. —For a recent description see Coker & Beers [Stip. Hydn. east. U.S. 83 *pls. 53 (top), 60 fs. 21-23.* 1951, as *Pseudohydnum thelephorum* (Lév.) Lloyd]. — Typonym: *Pseudohydnum* J. Rick (1904; preoccupied).

Hydnofomes P. Henn.—See "Polyporaceae."

Hydnoporia Murrill.—See "Polyporaceae."

Hydnophysa Clem.—See "Polyporaceae."

Hydnopsis (J. Schroet.) Rea *in* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. **3** : 127. 1909. — Etymology: the genus *Hydnum*; ὄψις, appearance. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species of basinym): "*Hydnum tomentosum* Schrad." = *Caldesiella ferruginosa* (Fr.) Sacc. — Basinym: *Phaeodon* subgen. *Hydnopsis* J. Schroet. *in* Cohn, Krypt.-Fl. Schles. **3** (1) : 458. 1888.—Based on a single species called by the author *Phaeodon tomentosus* (Schrad.) J. Schroet. — Valid publication & scope. The generic name was published when Rea had to describe a new species, which he called *Hydnopsis farinacea* Rea. His description runs:

> "*Hydnopsis* Schröt. Pileus resupinatus, effusus. Aculei subulati, gracillimi. Spora fusca vel violacea."—Rea (*l.c.*).

Both *Caldesiella ferruginosa* and *Hydnopsis farinacea,* the species mentioned respectively by Schroeter and Rea, are perfectly matched by it. — Typification. The only species treated under the avowed basinym is here taken as the type species, as nothing in Rea's publication of the generic name in 1909 suggests a different course. — Yet I cannot refrain from believing that Rea committed an error when he took up '*Hydnopsis,*' and that it was his intention to make use of *Amaurodon* J. Schroet., q.v. Both the type of the latter name and Rea's species are smooth-spored (while *Caldesiella ferruginosa* has rough spores). This would also account for the words "Spora fusca vel v i o l a c e a" [29]) in Rea's generic description, *Hydnopsis farinacea* having fuscous, and the species of *Amaurodon* violaceous, spores. Later on Rea (Brit. Bas. 650. 1922) retained *Hydnopsis* for *H. farinacea* (the *Amaurodon* species had at that time not yet been found in the British Isles), and treated *Caldesiella* Sacc. as a distinct genus; in so doing he excluded the type species of *Hydnopsis!* — W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 46. 1953) listed *Hydnopsis farinaceus* as the type of *Hydnopsis* "(Schroet)" Rea, without stating reasons. If this were acceptable he should have omitted the author's name between brackets. I do not feel that we are entitled completely to ignore the fact that Rea called his genus "*Hydnopsis* Schröt." If we would be entitled to correct a supposed error, we might exchange the type of *Phaeodon* subgen. *Hydnopsis* for that of *Amaurodon.* However, there is nothing in Rea's original generic description to prefer his new species above an other one. — Homonym. *Hydnopsis* Tul. (1865; Sphaeropsidales, Deuteromycetes), based on two separately described species, was not validly published by its authors, because no generic description was added. Perhaps the name was validly published afterwards by another author. — Typonyms: *Odontium* Rafin. (1817; devalidated name), *Odontia* Pers. ex Banker (1929; preoccupied); compare *Caldesiella* Sacc. (1877) and *Phaeodon* J. Schroet. (1888).

Hydnotrema Link.—See "Polyporaceae."

Hydnum L. *ex* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: lvi, 389. 1821. — Etymology: ὕδνον, ancient name for truffles. Gender: n.

Type species (selected): *Hydnum repandum* L. ex Fr.

Pre-Linnean name: *Hydna* L., Syst. nat. 1735; Gen. Pl. 327. 1737. — Devalidated name: *Hydnum* L., Spec. Pl. **2** : 1178. 1753; Gen. Pl., Ed. 5, 493. 1754.—Linnaeus's first description, of 1737, runs: "*Hydna. Erinaceus* Dill. Mich. 72. Fungus horizontalis, subtus fibris subulatis echinatus." No species were mentioned. In a previous publication (Syst. nat. 1735) he had listed it (name only) as "*Hydna. Erinaceus* D." (D. = Dillenius). One point is perfectly clear: *Hydna* (later *Hydnum)* as introduced by Linnaeus is a mere name change for *Erinaceus* Dill.! By the citation in 1735 of Dillenius, *Hydna* was associated with only one species, the fungus now known as *Hydnum repandum!* The genus *Erinaceus* Dill. (Cat. Pl. ca Gissam nasc. 188 & App. 74 *pl. 1.* 1719), namely, was introduced for this one species. Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 132 *pl. 72.* 1729) used *Erinaceus* for stipitate hydnums in general. Most of this was already pointed out by Banker:

[29]) Spacing is mine.

"[*Hydna* was introduced] without naming any species but [Linnaeus] cites '*Erinaceus* Dill.' Now Dillenius . . . figures and describes but one species which is evidently *H. repandum*. Linnaeus also clearly so understood it, for in Sp. Pl. **2** : 1178 under *H. repandum* he cites 'Flor Suecica, 1098' [= Linnaeus, Fl. Suec. 383 no. 1098. 1745], and in the last-named reference he cites again 'Dill. giss. 188.' "—Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 438. 1902).

At about the same time as that in which his "Genera" appeared, Linnaeus (Fl. lapp. 368. 1737) described two more species in a regional flora (of Lapland), "which, from the descriptions there given and from his own citations in Sp. Pl. **2** : 1178. 1753, are clearly *H. imbricatum* and *H. auriscalpium* respectively."—Banker (*l.c.*). In "Species Plantarum" (**2** : 1178. 1753), the number of species is four, *H. imbricatum* coming first and *H. repandum* second.

Scope. As used by Fries, *Hydnum* was a large genus; it included all Linnaeus's species and many more.

Monadelphous homonym: *Hydnum* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1** : 650. 1821.—Gray divided *Hydnum* L. (which he attributed to "Dillenius") into several genera. He retained the name *Hydnum* for *H. imbricatum* L. and placed *H. repandum* in *Dentinum* S. F. Gray. This was not intended as an emendation and a splitting up of *Hydnum* L. ex Fr., but was an independent re-publication of Dillenius's and Linnaeus's name starting from Persoon's "Synopsis Fungorum" (1801) after the nomenclatural starting-point date. This (mis)application, although performed in 1821, was actually forgotten until Banker (1902) once more took it into consideration.

Typification. It has already been pointed out that *H. repandum* was Linnaeus's only original species! The situation was aptly summarized by Banker:—

"*Hydnum repandum* is probably the oldest and most commonly known, as well as the most widely spread, species of the family . . . It is also undoubtedly the plant figured and described by Dillenius . . . upon which he founded the genus *Erinaceus*, the prototype of *Hydnum*. When, in 1753, Linnaeus adopted his binomial system of nomenclature, this species, although not placed first in his list, represents the nomenclatorial type of his genus *Hydnum*, according to the interpretation of the principles of generic types by the code here followed." [30])—Banker (*in* Mem. Torrey bot. Cl. **12** : 105. 1906).

Because *Hydnum* of Fries is nothing but an enlarged genus *Hydnum* of Linnaeus, I feel bound to accept *H. repandum* as the type species of the revalidated name too. The arguments for dropping it in favour of another species (namely of *H. imbricatum*, see below) are certainly not of enough weight. [31])

The first radical change in the delimitation of *Hydnum* in the wake of Fries's publications is that proposed by Quélet (*apud* Cooke & Quélet, Clav. Hym. 196. 1878; see also under *Calodon*); he restricted the genus (as "*Hydnum*, Q.") to the resupinate species. The name was applied in this circumscription by Karsten [*in* Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9) : 20. 1881, as *Hydnum* "Linn."], but not used at all by Quélet himself in subsequent publications (1886, 1888). Nobody has ever selected the type species of *Hydnum* from among the members of this group, for which the use of the name *Hydnum* is to be regarded as a misapplication.

The next author who considerably restricted the genus, was Karsten (1879; see also under *Calodon*). Like Quélet he started from the Friesian genus, rather than from the Linnean one, and he retained *Hydnum* for the group of stipitate, fleshy species to which both *H. imbricatum* and *H. repandum* belong. (In 1881 he abandoned the restricted use of *Hydnum* in this sense for the radically different one proposed by Quélet.) Then came Patouillard (Hym. Eur. 145. 1887) who excluded the *H. imbricatum* group (= *Sarcodon*) and retained under *Hydnum* only the *H. repandum* group. He was followed by Cejp (Monogr. Hydn. Českosl. *in* Fauna Fl. českosl., **2** : 79. 1928; *in* Bull. intern. Acad. Sci. Bohême **31** : 301. 1930) and by most subsequent authors who split the Friesian genus into several smaller ones. This series

---

[30]) That is, the now rejected American code sponsored by Underwood and his pupils; the first-species rule was a prominent element of it. Even with this code Banker felt himself obliged to select *H. repandum*!

[31]) W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 46. 1953) listed a genus *Hydnum* "L. ex Banker . . . 1906" with *H. repandum* as the type species, and also a genus *Hydnum* "L. ex Fr. . . . 1821" with *H. imbricatum*.

of emendations, which is to be regarded as the most noteworthy historical development in the reduction of *Hydnum* L. (ex Fr.) to a minor group including *H. repandum* but not containing *H. imbricatum*, has been adduced by Donk (Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. **2** : 14-15 June 22, 1933) as additional support in favour of the acceptance of *H. repandum* as the type species.

The only rival of *H. repandum* has been *H. imbricatum*. It was originally accepted as the type species of *Hydnum* L. by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 438, 447. 1902), but rejected afterwards by him in his monograph of the North American stipitate and pileate hydnums, where it was replaced by *H. repandum* (Banker *in* Mem. Torrey bot. Cl. **12** : 105. 1906). The same species was suggested by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 346. 1931), again for *Hydnum* L. 1753. This indication has been defended by Miller (*in* Mycologia **25** : 298, 300. Aug. 1, 1935) and by Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 62. 1943] [32]); this choice was largely induced by Gray's restriction of the name *Hydnum* to *H. imbricatum*. Miller was aware that he departed from contemporary usage by selecting *H. imbricatum*: "*Hydnum repandum* is the nomenclatorial type of *Hydnum* according to common usage" (p. 300); and under *Dentinum* S. F. Gray, the name he preferred for the *H. repandum* group, he stated: "This genus is commonly known today by the name *Hydnum*" (p. 298). I do not understand by which articles he felt himself obliged to restore "the earlier [?!] name *Dentinum* S. F. Gray . . . in accordance with the rules of the international code" (p. 298), and to state that, "According to the international rules it seems that *Hydnum imbricatum* L. must be regarded as the type" (p. 300).

Those mycologists who accept the splitting up of *Hydnum* into several smaller genera, are now almost unanimously using *Hydnum* for the *H. repandum* group, and *Sarcodon* P. Karst. for the *H. imbricatum* group. Miller, as a lonely dissenter, had and has but few followers even in the U.S.A. He has been obliged to apply the name *Dentinum* S. F. Gray to *Hydnum sensu stricto*, and the name *Hydnum* to *Sarcodon*! Hardly an improvement of the prevailing situation. If the acceptance of *H. imbricatum* as the type of *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. would have been a stabilizing factor of present conditions in nomenclatural respect, it would have been expedient, perhaps, to reconsider its substitution for *H. repandum*, but this is certainly not so.

From what has already been stated it will be clear that the following conclusion (Rogers *in* Farlowia **3** : 449. 1949) does not hold: "Miller . . . working under the International Rules, typified *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. emend. Gray by *H. imbricatum* . . . Now Gray must be considered the first post-Friesian author to restrict the originally inclusive genus *Hydnum*, and as such his decision is cogent if not irrevocable." This is a surprising conclusion indeed! First, their does not exist an emendation by Gray of *Hydnum* L. "ex Fr." Secondly, what Gray restricted was the pre-Friesian genus *Hydnum* "L." (which he ascribed to Dillenius!) and that genus started its life as a monotypic one, its only original species being *H. repandum*. Gray may be credited at most with misapplying *Hydnum* L. and since he did so after the starting-point date, with establishing a (monadelphous) homonym *Hydnum* S. F. Gray (non [Dill.] L.). Thirdly, if one wants to assume the attitude of a strict legalistic position, as Rogers does, one has to conclude that Miller merely was the first author who, very doubtfully, typified *Hydnum* L. "ex Fr." by *H. imbricatum* [33]); this was done shortly after Donk had already unambiguously typified the same name ("ex Fr."!) by *H. repandum*! — Remark. When Donk (*op cit.* p. 15) concluded that the facts clearly pointed to *H. repandum* as the type, he added quite inconsistently and superfluously: "Ich schlage jetzt vor den Namen *Hydnum* mit dem Typus *H. repandum* auf die Liste der Nomina conservanda zu setzen." Rogers (*l.c.*) took this as a proposal that aimed at the conservation of *Hydnum* against *Dentinum* S. F. Gray, q.v. He proceeded to advise its rejection. In case that the here accepted type would appear to be in danger, I would not hesitate to support a modus to attain the double goal of saving both the names *Hydnum* and *Sarcodon* P. Karst. (type of the

---

[32]) It is not evident at all wether Miller and Miller & Boyle ever indicated a type species for *Hydnum* L. "ex Fr." They cited "*Hydnum* L. ex Fr. . . . 1821, emend. Pat. . . . 1887" as a synonym under *Dentinum* S. F. Gray, and admitted a genus "*Hydnum* L. emend. S. F. Gray . . . 1821. Fries . . . 1821, in part." I think that they really 'typified' *Hydnum* L. and *Hydnum* S. F. Gray rather than *Hydnum* L. ex Fr.

[33]) See preceding footnote!

latter name, *Hydnum imbricatum* L. ex Fr.). — VARIANT SPELLINGS. The form '*Hydnum*,' instead of the original one '*Hydna*' (1735, 1737, cited above), was already preferred by Linnaeus himself. He first used it in his "Methodus sexualis" page 22 appended to his "Genera Plantarum" (1737), and soon accepted it definitely, for instance in his "Species Plantarum." The form *Hydna* was taken up by very few authors only: Guettard (Obs. Pl. **1** : 21. 1747) and after 1753 by Boehmer (Ludwig, Defin. Gen. Pl. 492. 1760), who cited Guettard as the author. — "*Hydrum*"; Lam., Tabl. encycl. Bot. **3** : 494. 1823. —See under *Hericius* Juss. ex Lam.

TYPONYMS: *Erinaceus* Dill. (1719; pre-Linnean), *Bidona* Adans. (1763; devalidated name), *Echinus* Haller (1768; devalidated name), *Dentinum* S. F. Gray (1821), *Tyrodon* P. Karst. (1881), and *Hypothele* Paul. ex Banker (1904; not validly published).

Hyphoderma Wallr.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Hypothele Paul. *ex* Banker *in* Torreya **4** : 113. 1904 (nomen nudum). — Protonym: *Hypothele* Paul., Iconogr. Champ. *pls.* 35, 35*bis*. 1812-35 (not validly published).— This name was given to a part ("famille" 25) of what Paulet had previously called *Fungus*, and to one additional species; first species, *Hypothele repanda* (L.) Paul. = *Hydnum repandum* L. ex Fr. — Paulet's generic name was not validly published and, assuming that it was published before 1821, cannot even be termed a devalidated name (no generic description). For some remarks on Paulet's generic names, see under *Agaricocarnis* ("Polyporaceae"). — Banker (*in* Torreya **4** : 113-117. 1904) used the name *Hypothele* only in the specific combination *Hydnum repandum*, the name of the species which he considered to be the type species. His paper deals with the variability of that fungus. However, he did not ensure the valid publication of the name for there is no accompanying generic description. The reference to Paulet is not valid, because, for one reason, it is to a name which itself is not accompanied by a description[34]); and, if we assume that Banker intended to found a new monotypic genus, the species on which it was based was not a new one. — I am not aware of any subsequent use; Banker himself rejected *Hypothele* in his later work. — Typonyms: *Erinaceus* Dill. (1719; pre-Linnean), *Bidona* Adans. (1763; devalidated name), *Echinus* Haller (1768; devalidated name), *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. (1821), *Dentinum* S. F. Gray (1821), and *Tyrodon* P. Karst. (1881).

Inonotus P. Karst.—See "Polyporaceae."

Irpex Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 81. 1825[35]); Elench. **1** : 142. 1828. — ETYMOLOGY: irpex, harrow. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hydnum lacteum* (Fr.) ex Fr. — SCOPE. When the name was first published (1825) no species were mentioned by name ("Species numerosae"). In 1828 the genus was fully dealt with, and then ten species were referred to it; the latter were divided over two tribes, viz '*Apus*' and '*Resupinatus*'; first species, *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. — TYPIFICATION. In 1828 Fries (Elench. 143) stated "Generis distinctionem primi indicarunt Albertini et Schweini[t]z." This can refer only to an observation made by these authors in connection with *Sistotrema pendulum* A. & S. (Consp. Fung. nisk. 261. 1805) = *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr., Fries's first species in 1828 (Elench. 143), to which Fries added the remark, "Optima generis species." All this draws the attention to *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. selected as the type by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 440, 448. 1902, for *Irpex* "1828"); by W. B. Cooke (*in* Lloydia **3** : 87. 1940). because it happened to be the first species; and by Donk (Rev. niederl. Hom.-Aphyll. **2** : 201. 1933), because of the remark quoted. However, there is another side to this question which may be briefly expounded. The sentence of 1828 just quoted, "Generis distinctionem . . .," reminds one of a similar remark under *Radulum* Fr. (Syst. Orb. veg. 81. 1825): "*Radulum* . . .; primam speciem proprii generis typum jam censent acutissimi Albertini et Schweinitz. . . . H. l. *Hydnum pendulum* . . ." The same idea in connection with the same epithet, in 1825 under *Radulum*, in 1828 under *Irpex*! I believe the situation may be explained as follows. About 1825 Fries had three new genera in stock, *Radulum*, *Irpex*, and a third one of which we do not even know the manuscript name but which would have included *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. Afterwards Fries decided to drop this last genus, and when he published his "Systema

[34]) Paulet used *Hypothele* merely as the generic appellation in specific names on two plates.

[35]) See also page 362.

orbis vegetabilis" he included—by error—the clause just quoted under *Radulum* instead of under *Irpex* (which appeared on the same page!). However, when he published his "Elenchus" he corrected his error and transferred the (altered) remark to *Irpex*.[36]) Seen in this light, the note "Optima generis species" under *H. pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr., as a member of *Irpex*, acquires a different meaning, so much as: 'This belongs to *Irpex*, rather than elsewhere.' Such a statement would not fit in with the actual—not indicated—type species, of which this needed hardly to be said. Confirmation of the thesis that in reality three genera were involved, of which one afterwards was suppressed, first by reducing it (by error) to *Radulum* and later on to *Irpex*, may be found in his subsequent work. For instance, we find under *Irpex pendulus* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Fr. in Fries's "Hymenomycetes europaei" (p. 620, 1874) this passage: "Characteres omnino generis [*Irpicis*], sed nulli alii fungo hydneo affinis, potissimum vero *Cyphellae* et remotius *Trogiae*, ut facile peculiaris generis typus." *Hydnum pendulum* is here still the troublesome fungus, for which he still considers the desirability of publishing a proper genus. If the above interpretation of the facts is thought to be acceptable, the consequences are that *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. should neither be selected as the type species of *Radulum* Fr., q.v., nor as the type species of *Irpex*. Personally, I now reject *H. pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. as the type species of *Irpex*. — Another species, *Hydnum lacteum* (Fr.) ex Fr., has been selected as the type by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 346. 1931), Bondarzew & Singer (*in* Ann. mycol. **39** : 63. 1941; *apud* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36** : 67. 1944), Imazeki (*in* Bull. Tokyo Sci. Mus. No. 6 : 53. 1943), and Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept. sci. ind. Res., N. Zeal. No. 82 : 2. 1949). I recommend this choice for acceptance, because it served already as the type species in recent publications. Perhaps *Irpex fuscoviolaceus* (Ehrenb. ex Fr.) Fr. would have been preferable?! — VARIANT SPELLING: *Irpex* S. Schulz. *apud* S. Schulz., Kanitz & Knapp *in* Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien **16** (Abhand.): 46. 1866.

Irpicochaete J. Rick *in* Ann. mycol. **38** : 58. 1940. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Irpex*; *χαίτη*, hair. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Irpicochaete nodulosa* J. Rick (*"nodulosum"*). — REMARK. Although the (complete) generic description runs, "*Irpex* cum dendrophysibus," the description of the only species contains, ". . . dentibus . . . subulatis, regularibus."

Irpex.—See *Irpex*.

Kavinia Pilát *in* Stud. bot. čechoslov. **1** : 3. 1938. — ETYMOLOGY: C. Kavina. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Caldesiella sajanensis* Pilát.—According to Pilát (*apud* Christiansen *in* Friesia **4** : 336. 1953) this is synonymous with *Clavaria bourdotii* Bres. (which, in its turn, belongs to *Hydnum alboviride* Morg.); John Eriksson (*in* Svensk bot. Tidskr. **48** : 198. 1954), too, identified Pilát's species with *C. bourdotii*.

Kneiffia Fr.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Kneiffiella Underw.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Kneiffiella P. Henn.—See "Thelephoraceae."

[*Kordyanella* Höhn.—See under Exobasidiaceae.]

Leaia Banker *in* Mem. Torrey bot. Cl. **12** . 175. 1906. — ETYMOLOGY: T. G. Lea. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Leaia piperata* Banker.—According to Banker himself (*in* Mycologia **2** : 7-11. 1910) and to Miller [*apud* Miller & Boyle *in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 9-10. 1943], and verified by me after the study of a part of the type collection in my herbarium, this species is synonymous with *Gloiodon strigosus* (Sw. ex Fr.) P. Karst. — SCOPE. Based on two species. No type indicated. — TYPIFICATION. In agreement with the code of nomenclature followed by the author of the name, the first species is here considered to be the type. Already accepted as such by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 54. 1953). — TYPONYMS: *Gloiodon* P. Karst. (1879) and *Sclerodon* P. Karst. (1889).

Leptochaete Lév.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Leptodon Quél., Ench. Fung. 191. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: *λεπτός*, thin; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hydnum pudorinum* Fr.—Now often accepted as a synonym of *H. ochraceum* Pers. ex Fr.

---

[36]) The first name mentioned under *Radulum* in 1825 is, as stated above, "*Hydnum pendulum*," the species under discussion. In 1828 Albertini & Schweinitz's species is found as the first species under *Irpex* as *I. pendulus*, and the first species of *Radulum* is *Radulum pendulum* Fr.

— Scope. Introduced (with seven species) for (i) *Hydnum* trib. *Pleuropus* Fr. (Epicr. 510. 1838; Hym. europ. 606. 1874; not *Hydnum* trib. *Pleuropus* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 407. 1821), and (ii) *Hydnum* trib. *Apus* groups *** and **** (Fries, Hym. europ. 611. 1874), although Quelét did not refer to them. The genus matches *Pleurodon* Quél., but is somewhat restricted by the exclusion of Fries's first two groups of *Hydnum* trib. *Apus* Fr. — Typification. The name was taken up by Patouillard (Hym. Eur. 146. 1887) and limited to the non-stipitate species, and thus such species as *Hydnum occidentale* Fr. and *H. auriscalpium* L. ex Fr. were excluded; he mentioned as representatives of his emended genus "*L. pudorinum, L. ochraceum,* etc.," two of the species included by Quélet. Afterwards Patouillard renamed this emended genus *Mycoleptodon* Pat., q.v., *Leptodon* Quél. being preoccupied; at this occasion Patouillard mentioned only *H. pudorinum* as an example, thus singling the latter out for both *Leptodon* (indirectly) and for its isonym *Mycoleptodon*. — It was only afterwards that Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29**: 443, 448. 1902) considered Quélet's first species, *H. occidentale*, as the type. This latter species may be disregarded in favour of *H. pudorinum*. — Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 174. 1941; under *Mycoleptodon*) and W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas: 56. 1953 [37])) took *H. auriscalpium* as the type species, which would appear to be an indefensible choice. — Homonym: *Leptodon* Weber apud Mohr (1803; Neckeraceae, Musci frondosi); compare Dixon (*in* Rev. bryol. lichén. **7**: 138-139. 1934). — Isonym: *Mycoleptodon* Pat. (1900), q.v. — Typonyms: *Steccherinum* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Odontina* Pat. (1887). — Status. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Licentia Pilát.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Lopharia Kalchb. & McOwan.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Lyomyces P. Karst. 1881.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Malocodon Bataille *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **39**: 203. 1923. — Etymology: *μαλακός*, soft; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (only original species): *Hydnum candidum* Schmidt = *Hydnum candidum* Schmidt ex Fr.—Our knowledge of this fungus seems to be restricted to the original description.

Manina Adans.—See "Clavariaceae."

Manina Banker *in* Mycologia **4**: 275. 1912. — Etymology: an Italian fungus name, derived from mano, hand. Gender: f. — Type species (by original designation): *Manina cordiformis* Scop. sensu Banker = *Hydnum erinaceus* Bull. ex Fr. — Scope. Introduced for a genus equivalent to *Hericium* Pers. and including as its most prominent members both *Hydnum erinaceus* and *H. coralloides* Scop. ex Fr. — Remarks. Banker rejected *Manina* Adans. (1763; "Clavariaceae"), q.v., as an unacceptable name because it was not associable with 'binomials.' He ascribed *Manina* to Scopoli. The latter author [Scopoli, Diss. Sci. nat. **1** (Pl. subterr.): 97. 1772] was the first to use Adanson's generic name, as "*Manina*. Adanson. Famil. Plant. p. 5," in binomials in accordance to the Linnean nomenclatural method. Or, rather, he merely added seven species to it: '*Manina* Scop.' is nothing but an application of *Manina* Adans. Nevertheless, this complementary part Banker considered to be a genus of its own, properly named, and distinct from *Manina* Adans.; moreover, he took Scopoli's first species as the type. From our point of view there is no '*Manina* Scop.' except as a later application of *Manina* Adans. and Banker's use of it resulted in the valid publication of a 'new' generic name; neither Adanson nor Scopoli must be cited as the pre-starting-point author in connection with Banker's name. — "*Manium* Scop. pl. subterr. t. x," cited as a synonym of *Hydnum* Fr. (*Bidona* Adans.) by Endlicher (Gen. Pl. 39. 1836) must be an error for "*Manina*." — Homonym: *Manina* Adans. (1763; "Clavariaceae"; devalidated name). — Typonyms. It is likely that both *Hericium* Fr. (1825; preoccupied), q.v., and *Medusina* Chev. (1826), q.v., are based on abnormal forms of *H. erinaceus;* and compare *Martella* Endl. (1836) and *Martella* Adans. ex O.K. (1898; preoccupied).

Manium "Scop."—See under *Manina* Banker.

Martella Adans.—See *Martella* Adans. ex O.K.

Martella Adans. *ex* O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 492. 1898. — Etymology: martello, Italian for scourge. — Type species (selected): *Agaricum* ordo VI sp. no. 1 Mich., Nov. Pl. Gen. 122 *pl. 64 f. 1* = *Hericium hystrix* Pers.—This has been accepted as a good

[37]) Cooke also listed *Leptodon* Quél. "sensu Pat." with *Hydnum pudorinum* as the type species.

species although it has apparently never been seen by modern authors. It is, I believe, a species of *Hericium* Pers. ex S. F. Gray and perhaps a not too abnormal form of *Hericium erinaceus* (Bull. ex Fr.) Pers. It is possible that the fungus grew downwards; and not upwards, which was Fries's reason for keeping this and similar fungi in a genus of their own, under the name of *Hericium* Fr., distinct from *Hericium* Pers. (*Hydnum* trib. *Merisma* Fr.) — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Martela* Adans., Fam. Pl. **2** : 5. 1763. — Adanson cited as representatives of his genus: *Agaricum* ordo VI nos. 1 & 2 (*pl. 64 fs. 1, 2*) of Micheli (*l.c.* p. 122), a species of Battarra (Fungi Agri arimin. Hist. 67 *pl. 33 f. C.* 1755), and one of Vaillant (Bot. paris. *pl. 8 f. 1* [38]). Only Micheli's two species will be taken into account here. The first of these was the basis of *Hericium hystrix* Pers. = *Hydnum hystrix* (Pers.) ex Fr. (see above), the second [39] appears to me as perhaps identical with *Manina flagellum* Scop. (cf. Banker *in* Mycologia **4** : 276. 1912), but in any case it must be identified with *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. ex Fr. [40] — The first (pre-Friesian) author to introduce *Martela* in the Linnean binomial nomenclature system was Scopoli [Annus IV hist.-nat. (IV. Fungi quidam rariores in Hungaria nunc detecti) : 151. 1770 [41]]. He cited the name as "*Martella* Adans. Fam. Plant. II. p. 5.," gave no generic description or remarks, but described a new species, *Martella echinus* Scop., [42] under this generic name. It will be clear from these remarks that Scopoli accepted Adanson's genus without restrictions; the only thing he did was to add a new representative to it. Shortly afterwards, Scopoli (Fl. carniolica, Ed. 2, **2** : 472-473. 1772) abandoned the genus and included it in *Hydnum* L.; under *Hydnum coralloides* Scop. he cited *Martella* Adans. as well as Micheli's second species (*pl. 64. fig. 2*) as a synonym (". . . huic proximum"). See further *Martella* Endl. — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. Adanson's generic name, with the reference "*Martella* A. 1763 Fam. II : 5 em. Scop. 1772 Pl. subterr. 151," was taken up after 1821 by O. Kuntze (*l.c.*), who used it instead of "*Hericium* Pers. 1797 . . . Saccardo syll. VI : 479." In the absence of an accompanying description the valid publication of '*Martella* Adans.' by Kuntze depends on the reference to Adanson's pre-Friesian description. — TYPIFICATION. Kuntze (*l.c.*) considered the first of Micheli's species (*Hericium hystrix*) to be the type of *Martela* Adans. He preferred to adopt "*Agaricus*" [= *Hydnum*] *hystricinum* Batsch as basinym, correctly from his point of view since it was an earlier name than *Hericium hystrix*, both introduced for Micheli's species. Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **2** : 466. 1954) accepted Kuntze's choice. — VARIANT SPELLING. Adanson's original spelling is *Martela*. The common conviction of all authors who applied or mentioned this name appears to be that it should be spelt *Martella*, it being evidently derived from the Italian martello, scourge. — HOMONYM. *Martella* Endl. (1836; "Hydnaceae"), q.v. — TYPONYMS: *Hericium* Fr. (1825; preoccupied), and perhaps *Medusina* Chev. (1826) and *Manina* Banker (1912), and presumably also *Martella* Endl. (1836). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Martella Endl., Gen. Pl. 36. 1836. — ETYMOLOGY: martello, Italian for scourge. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Martella echinus* Scop. = *Hydnum echinus* (Scop.) ex

---

[38]) The citation of Vaillant's plate 8 "f. 1" is an obvious error as already pointed out by Leman (*in* Dict. Sci. nat. **29** : 259. 1823); I think that either 'f. 3' or 'f. 4' was meant and would also draw attention to the fact that 'f. 1' was the base of Adanson's genus *Kordera* (Deuteromycetes), q.v.

[39]) *Agaricum* [ordo VI] *esculentum, album, cespitosum, multifidum, & denticulatum, denticulis asperis* Mich.

[40]) In another paper I hope conclusively to demonstrate that *Manina flagellum* Scop. sensu Banker and *Hydnum laciniatum* Leers sensu Banker are synonymous with *Hydnum coralloides* and that the species called *Hydnum* (or *Hericium*) *coralloides* by Banker and Coker & Beers must receive another name.

[41]) Several authors (including Endlicher and O. Kuntze) cited Scopoli's use of *Martella* as 'pl. subterr. 151 [1772].' There can be no doubt that they did not look up either the latter publication or the correct one.

[42]) The species was said to resemble entirely, in habit and in stature, Micheli's fungus that was later on to be called *Hericium hystrix* (type species selected for *Martela* Adans.), but to differ in its yellow colour (flavus) and its fistulose spines. It was not positively stated that it was growing upright; one is tempted to interpret it as a (weathered) form of *Hericium hystrix* = *H. erinaceus*.

Fr.—See foot-note 42 under *Martella* Adans. ex O.K. — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. Endlicher supplied a description. However, he did not mention any species by name, but referred to "*Martella* Scop. pl. subterr. 151. *Hericium* Fries pl. homon. 88. *Hydna Gomphi* Fries Syst. I. 410." — TYPIFICATION. From the erroneous citation "*Martella* Scop. pl. subterr. 151" one would conclude that Endlicher did not verify it. What he incorrectly transcribed was "*Martella* Scop. Fung. Hung. p. 151" as cited by Fries (Syst. mycol. **1** : 410. 1821) as a synonym under "*H[ydnum] Echinus.*" Endlicher committed the error (afterwards repeated by other authors) of assuming the identity of the two works by Scopoli.[43]) What happened, I think, is this: In 1821 Fries mentioned *Martella* [*echinus*] Scop. as a synonym (basinym) of *Hydnum echinus* (Scop.) ex Fr., omitting the epithet "echinus" by error. After Fries had raised his '*Gomphi*' to generic rank under the name *Hericium* Fr., q.v., Endlicher noticed that that author had not taken up the generic name *Martella* and concluded that Scopoli was the originator of a genus '*Martella* Scop.' with a single species *(Hydnum echinus);* at the same time he overlooked the existence of *Martella* Adans., q.v. The result was that he 'corrected' Fries and 'restored' what he thought was the name that should be used for reasons of priority. Although taxonomically *Martella* of Endlicher and *Hericium* Fr., as originally published, cover the same group, the former name is from a nomenclatural point of view, obligately coupled with *M. echinus,* while we are not obliged to select the same species as the type of *Hericium* Fr. *Martella* Endl. is, therefore, not necessarily an isonym of *Hericium* Fr. These considerations will help to understand why Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **2** : 466. 1954) selected *Martella echinus* as the type species.— REMARK. Scopoli's use of *Martella* Adans. (the first application of the latter name in the binomial system) can be no reason for admitting a generic name '*Martella* Scop. (not *Martella* Adans.)' and consequently one is not authorized to speak of '*Martella* Scop. ex Endl.' Neither should one speak of '*Martella* Adans. ex Endl.' because the type *(Martella echinus)* is not the same as that of *Martela* Adans. *(Hericium hystrix),* not even if the two plants might be considered as forms of a single species. Thus we arrive at '*Martella* Endl. (not *Martella* Adans.).' — HOMONYM: *Martella* Adans. ex O.K. (1898; "Hydnaceae"; preoccupied), q.v. — *Martellia* Mattir. (1900; Gastromycetes) is not a homonym, being called after U. Martelli. — TYPONYMS. The following names might perhaps prove to be typonyms: *Hericium* Fr. (1825; preoccupied), *Medusina* Chev. (1826), *Martella* Endl. (1836), *Martella* Adans. ex O.K. (1898; preoccupied), and *Manina* Banker (1912).

[*Matruchotria* Boul.—See "Clavariaceae."]

Medusina Chev., Fl. gén. Env. Paris **1** : 278. 1826. — ETYMOLOGY: Medusa, Greek goddess. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Medusina patula* Chev., an isonym of *Hydnum caput-medusae* (Bull.) ex Fr.—This seems to represent a somewhat abnormal form of *Hydnum erinaceus* Bull. ex Fr.: compare Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 443. 1928). — SCOPE. Introduced with two species. — TYPIFICATION. No doubt the first species has to be selected as the type; it was already indicated as such by Banker (*in* Mycologia **4** : 272, 275. 1912).

Mucronella Fr., Hym. europ. 629. 1874. — ETYMOLOGY: mucronella, little sharp point. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Hydnum calvum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. — BASINYM: *Mucronia* Fr. (1849), q.v. — SCOPE. Three species were included when this name change was affected; the third is *Mucronella calva* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Fr. — TYPIFICATION. The type species of the basinym, *Isaria calva,* has generally been indicated as type: Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 442, 448. 1902), Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 346. 1931), Miller (*in* Mycologia **25** : 295. 1933), Doty (*in* Lloydia **11** : 132. 1948), and Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 6. 1943]. — Corner (Monogr. Clavaria 689. 1950) preferred *Mucronella aggregata* (Fr.) Fr. (see under *Mucronia).*

Mucronia Fr., Summa Veg. Scand. **2** ; 329. 1849. — ETYMOLOGY: mucro, -onis, the sharp point of a sword, poniard. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Hydnum calvum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. — PROTONYM: *Mucronia* Fr., Syst. mycol. **3** (2) : 278. 1832.— Mentioned as a provisional name under *Isaria calva* (A. & S.) ex Fr. as follows: "Maxime itaque recidit, *Solenis* fructificatione, non forma, proxima, sui generis: *Mucronia,* quale limitibus vagis hoc loco recipere nolui." — REMARK. Corner (Mono-

[43]) See also foot-note 41. Afterwards Fries (Hym. europ. 617. 1874) cited: "*Martella Echinus* Scop. Ann. IV, Hist. nat. p. 151."

gr. Clavaria 689. 1950) indicated as the type of *Mucronia* as well as of *Mucronella* a species not originally included in *Mucronia*, viz. *Mucronia aggregata* Fr. This species is perhaps the best known representative of those that are to-day retained in the genus, but it is obviously unacceptable. — HOMONYM: *Mucronea* Benth. (1836; Polygonaceae; note the slight difference in spelling). — ISONYM. Fries changed the name into *Mucronella* Fr., q.v., presumably on account of the earlier homonym. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Mycoacia Donk *in* Meded. Nederl. mycol. Ver. **18-20** : 150. 1931. — ETYMOLOGY: *μύκης*, fungus; the genus *Acia* P. Karst. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Hydnum fuscoatrum* Fr. ex Fr. — BASINYM. A "nov. nom." for "*Acia* Pat., Ess. tax. 68, 1900; *Acia* Karst. pr. p.; non *Acia* Schreb." — REMARK. The name was accompanied by a (Dutch) description, and in a foot-note by the remark that "*Acia* Pat." had to be rebaptized. — The indication by Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 38. 1943] of *Hydnum setosum* Pers. as the species is evidently due to an error.

Mycobonia Pat.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Mycoleptodon Pat., Cat. rais. Pl. cell. Tunis. 54. 1897; Essai taxon. Hym. 116. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: *μύκης*, fungus; the genus *Leptodon*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (same as of basinym): *Hydnum pudorinum* Fr.— This is now fused with *H. ochraceum* Pers. ex Fr. — BASINYM: *Leptodon* Quél. (1886), q.v.—Mentioned by Patouillard as "*Leptodon* Quélet Enchirid. 191; Pat. Hym. d'Europ. 146; (non Mohr)." — SCOPE & TYPIFICATION. *Hydnum pudorinum* was selected by Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17** : 174. 1941). It was the only species mentioned when the name was introduced and the first one enumerated in 1900. This choice matches the notion that *Mycoleptodon* is an isonym of *Leptodon*. — REMARK. Before accepting S. F. Gray's "Natural Arrangement" as being published after Fries's "Systema," volume 1, Donk (*op. cit.* pp. 157, 174) moved a proposal to conserve *Mycoleptodon* against *Odontia* Fr. (non Pers.) with *Hydnum fimbriatum* (Pers.) ex Fr. as the type species and which according to some mycologists is a member of *Mycoleptodon*. The proposal was withdrawn when *Odontia* S. F. Gray was accepted as validly published and, therefore, *Odontia* Fr., as impriorable (Donk *in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18** : 100. 1949).[44]) There seemed to be no sufficient reason to insist on the conservation of *Mycoleptodon* against *Steccherinum* S. F. Gray. — TYPONYMS: *Steccherinum* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Odontina* Pat. (1887).

Neokneiffia Sacc.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Odontia Hill (pre-Linnean name).—See under *Odontia* S. F. Gray.

Odontia Pers. ex Banker.—See under *Odontia* S. F. Gray.

Odontia S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1** : 651. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: *ὀδών, -όντος* tooth. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hydnum obtusum* Schrad.—This species has been identified with *Radulum quercinum* (Fr., non Pers.) Fr. by Fries (Hym. europ. 623. 1874). — 'PROTONYM': *Odontia* Hill, General nat. Hist. **2** : 30. 1751.—This is, as far as I have been able to find out, the first introduction of the name. It covers a genus of Hill's Fungi, Class the first, "such as grow in horizontal direction on trees," and was characterized as having "their under surface formed into oblong, slender bodies, like teeth." Contents: non-centrally stipitate hydnums. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Odontia* Pers. *in* Neues Mag. Bot. **1** : 110. 1794 (= Tent. 30. 1797).—Introduced with two new strictly resupinate species, *O. ferruginea* Pers. and *O. nivea* Pers., in this order. Soon afterwards Persoon (Obs. mycol. **2** : 16-17. 1799) added some more species: *O. crustosa* Pers., *O. cerąsi* Pers., and *O. quercina* Pers. Again a few years later Persoon (Syn. Fung. 560. 1801) brought the number of species up to ten and reduced the taxon in rank: *Hydnum* sect. *Odontia* (Pers.) Pers. Isonym of the latter name: *Odontium* Rafin. (1817), q.v. — SCOPE. Persoon's group of 1801, rather than the original genus, was taken up by Gray and raised to generic rank. He called the genus "*Odontia*. Persoon." The circumscription of the group was not altered, but Gray recorded only two (British)

---

[44]) The proposal was nevertheless maintained by the Secretary of the Special Committee for Fungi and submitted to a vote. It was rejected by ballot by the Committee (*in* Taxon **2** : 31. 1953; *in* Mycologia **45** : 320. 1953). The Secretary evidently confused proposals of this kind with valid publication of names; and forgot that accepted procedure admits withdrawal of nomenclatural proposals by their authors.

species in his regional flora: *Hydnum obtusum* and *H. diaphanum* Schrad. (specific definitions translated from Persoon's "Synopsis," pp. 562, 563!). — TYPIFICATION. If no later starting-points had been introduced, Gray's use of *Odontia* would be considered to be but a mere application of Persoon's name. Now that we are forced to take it as the valid re-publication of the name, two courses are open to arrive at a decision as to what is to be considered Gray's original species; we might make our choice of (i) all of Persoon's species of 1801, or (ii) of the two mentioned in Gray's British flora. Personally, I would prefer the first course because Gray did not alter the circumscription of the genus; this would lead to the selection of one of Persoon's original species (of 1794), viz. *Odontia ferruginea* (see below). The alternative course would lead to the selection of, for instance, *Hydnum obtusum*. In the first case, *Odontia* would become the correct name for *Caldesiella* Sacc. (1877), an interpretation already sponsored by Banker (see below). In the second case, *Odontia* would be the correct name for a quite different genus, depending on the position assigned to *Hydnum obtusum* (which, eventually, might be regarded as a nomen dubium). In agreement with recent usage the second course is adopted, and consequently *Odontia* S. F. Gray is treated as dissociated from *Odontia* Pers., the original species recorded under the two names being different. — Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 346. 1931) suggested *Hydnum fimbriatum* Pers. ex Fr. as the type species of "*Odontia* Pers. 1796." The same species was chosen by Miller (*in* Mycologia **25** : 293. 1933; **26** : 19. 1934) and Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 19. 1943] for "*Odontia* Pers. emend. Fries, Epicr. 528. 1838." This is, of course, neither acceptable for *Odontia* Pers. nor for *Odontia* S. F. Gray; but compare the homonym *Odontia* Fr. — W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 67. 1953) listed Gray's first species *(Hydnum obtusum)* as the type of *Odontia* Pers. ex S. F. Gray. — MONADELPHOUS HOMONYM: *Odontia* Pers. *ex* Banker *in* Mycologia **21** : 147. 1929.—With *O. ferruginea* = *Caldesiella ferruginosa* (Fr.) Sacc. as type species, *Odontia* Pers., as emended and re-published by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 448. 1902, indication of type species; *in* Mycologia **21** : 147. 1929, application of Persoon's generic name), is a monadelphous homonym of *Odontia* S. F. Gray. One is also reminded of Patouillard's conception (Hym. Eur. 149. 1887) of "*Odontia* (Fr.)" which, like Banker's, equals *Caldesiella;* however, this use is rather to be taken as a misapplication of *Odontia* Fr. (1835). Typonyms (of *Odontia* Pers. ex Banker): *Odontium* Rafin. (1817; devalidated name), *Caldesiella* Sacc. (1877), *Hydnopsis* (J. Schroet.) Rea (1909), and compare *Phaeodon* J. Schroet. (1888). — REMARK. If Gray's name is typified by *Hydnum obtusum,* the course reluctantly adopted above, the name ought to be cited as *Odontia* S. F. Gray (non Pers.). — HOMONYMS: *Odontia* Fr. (1835; "Hydnaceae"), q.v. — Compare also *Odontium* Rafin. (1817; "Hydnaceae"; devalidated name). —

Odontia Fr., Fl. scan. 340. 1835; Gen. Hym. 13. 1836; Epicr. 528. 1838. — ETYMOLOGY: *ὀδών, —όντος,* tooth. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by 'original' designation in 1836, and in 1838 under *Odontia fimbriata*): *Hydnum fimbriatum* (Pers.) ex Fr. — SCOPE & TYPIFICATION. In 1835 no species were mentioned, but in 1836 (as well as in 1838) the type was explicitely designated; in 1836 some other species were mentioned in addition.[45]) — REMARK. See also "Remark" under *Mycoleptodon.* — HOMONYMS: *Odontia* Pers. (1794; "Hydnaceae"), q.v., and *Odontia* S. F. Gray (1821; "Hydnaceae"), q.v. — *Odontia* Fr. cannot be interpreted as a monadelphous homonym of *Odontia* S. F. Gray (which in its turn is a derivative of *Odontia* Pers.). When Fries had disposed of *Odontia* Pers. as a synonym, he introduced a new genus with the 'same' name (and consequently did not mention Persoon as the author). Similar cases are those of *Corticium* Pers. and *Corticium* Fr., *Hericium* Pers. and *Hericium* Fr., and so on. The confusing point is that the differences between the two genera are but very slight in the light of their descriptions. I am not the first who felt bound to consider *Odontia* Fr. as a normal homonym (cf. Donk *in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17** : 174. 1941) of the earlier name *Odontia* Pers. (and of

---

[45]) W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 67. 1953) must have interchanged the specific names when he listed "*Odontia fimbriata* Fr." as type species of "*Odontia* Fr. sensu Pat. Hym. Eur. 149. 1887" (a species Patouillard did not mention), and "*Odontia barba-jovis* Fr." as type species of "*Odontia* Fr. Fl. Scan. 1835." The "sensu Pat." in this case merely means that *O. barba-jovis* is that author's first species.

Odontia S. F. Gray): Banker came to the same conclusion and replaced Fries's *Odontia* by *Etheirodon* Banker, q.v. Fries's earlier group *Hydnum* sect. *Odontia* (Obs. mycol. **1** : 149. 1815) is rather an application of *Hydnum* sect. *Odontia* Pers.; he cited no author and entered three (additional) species, viz. *Hydnum pinastri* Fr., *H. fuscoatrum* Fr., and *H. agardhii* Fr. — Isonym: *Etheirodon* Banker (1902), q.v. — Status. Impriorable on account of *Odontia* S. F. Gray (1821).

Odontina Pat., Hym. Eur. 147. 1887. — Etymology: derived from *Odontia.* Gender: f. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum denticulatum* Pers.—As previously described and depicted by Patouillard (Tab. anal. Fung. **1** : 64 *no. 148.* 1883), this species is conspecific with *Hydnum ochraceum* Pers. ex Fr. (or, perhaps, with *H. pudorinum* Fr., which, however, is to-day not regarded as specifically distinct from *H. ochraceum).* — Scope. The genus was introduced for species with "cystides *très saillantes,* à parois souvent épaises ou rugueuses et qui sont très abondantes à l'extremité stérile des aiguillons." [46]) The fruit-bodies were described as "résupinés ou étales réfléchis, à receptacle mince, *coriace* ou pulvérulent." [46]) "Espèces principales: *O. denticulata, O. junquillea, O. hyalina, O. stipata, O. farinacea,* etc." The first of these is an effused-reflexed species, the others are strictly resupinate and represent a good portion of *Odontia* "Fr." as emended by Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 419. 1928). With "*O*[*dontina*] *junquillea*" *Odontia junquillea* Quél. is meant, a species of which previously a correct interpretion was given by Patouillard (Tab. anal. Fung. **1** : 65 *no. 149.* 1883) and which is now often referred to *Odontia corrugata* (Fr.) Bourd. & G. One of the other original species, "*O. farinacea*" is, I think, *Odontia farinacea* (Pers. [ex Fr.]) Quél. sensu Quél., afterwards renamed *Odontia queletii* Bourd. & G.; the presence of conspicuous cystidia and smooth spores (as required by the generic description) makes this conclusion very likely. The identity of the two other examples listed is not so easily determinable. — Typification. The first species, "*O. denticulata,*" was considered to be the type by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 445, 448. 1902). Its presence in *Odontina* leads to the conclusion that in 1887 Patouillard was still unaware of the microscopical structure of the genus which he at that time called *Leptodon* Quél. ("Espèces principales: *L. pudorinum, L. ochraceum*") and of which he did not mention the cystidia. Afterwards Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 60. 1900) listed *Odontina* as a synonym of *Odontia* Fr., [47]) which he restricted to resupinate species and which he characterized thus: "Receptacle résupiné, coriace membraneux ou crustacé . . .; cystides rarement nulles, isolées ou fasciculées, fréquemment réunies en bouquet au sommet des aspérités de la surface . . ." (p. 60). For *Mycoleptodon* Pat., that is, *Leptodon* of 1887, he gave as important characters: "Receptacle mince, ténace, résupiné-réfléchi, dimidié ou attenué en stipe . . .. Très souvent des cystides hyalines, épaisses, rugueuses, abondantes surtout à la pointe des aiguillons. . . ." (p. 116). *Hydnum denticulatum* was not mentioned as an example under either *Odontia* or *Mycoleptodon:* it may be assumed that it was reduced to the synonymy of one of the species of the latter genus. This conclusion necessitates reconsidering the choice of *H. denticulatum,* because it was indicated as type species at a later date. If it would agree better than the other original species with the generic description, it would have to be retained; if not, the selection of another species, for instance *Odontia junquillea,* would be indicated. After a carefully study of the generic description of *Odontina* and especially after comparing it with that of *Mycoleptodon,* I feel bound to assume that *Hydnum denticulatum* indeed stood foremost in Patouillard's mind when he published *Odontina,* and I therefore prefer to maintain that species as the type. — Variant spelling: "*Odontinia*": Banker *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 445, 448. 1902. — Typonyms: *Steccherinum* S. F. Gray (1821), *Leptodon* Quél. (1886; preoccupied), and *Mycoleptodon* Pat. (1897).

Odontinia.—See *Odontina.*

Odontiochaete J. Rick *in* Ann. mycol. **38** : 60. 1940. — Etymology: The genus *Odontia; χαίτη,* hair. Gender; f. — Type species (only original species): *Odontiochaete alba* J. Rick ("*album*").

O d o n t i u m Rafin. *in* Amer. monthly Mag. **1** : 429.1817 (devalidated name). — An isonym

[46]) Italics as in the original.

[47]) *Odontia* "(Fr.)" as defined by Patouillard in 1887 is identical with the genus now called *Caldesiella* Sacc. When in 1900 he accepted the latter name, he applied *Odontia* in a different sense.

of *Hydnum* sect. *Odontia* (Pers.) Pers. (Syn. Fung. 560. 1801) = *Odontia* Pers. (*in* Neues Mag. Bot. **1** : 110. 1794 = Tent. 30. 1797). In a review of Eaton's "Manual," Rafinesque (*l.c.*) remarked with regard to the resupinate *Hydnum chrysorhizon* Eaton (Man. 140. 1817): "It must belong to the genus *Odontium* of Rafinesque: *Odontia* section of Persoon." Thus, *Odontium* Rafin. was a new generic name established through a reference to, and hence fully identical with, Persoon's group of 1801, and accordingly the type species should be the same: *Odontia ferruginea* Pers. = *Caldesiella ferruginosa* (Fr.) Sacc.; see *Odontia* Pers. ex Banker, under *Odontia* S. F. Gray. — TYPONYMS: *Hydnopsis* (J. Schroet.) Rea (1909), *Odontia* Pers. ex Banker (1929; preoccupied), and *Caldesiella* Sacc. (1877); compare *Phaeodon* J. Schroet. (1888).

Oxydontia L. W. Miller *in* Mycologia **25** : 294. 1933. — ETYMOLOGY: *ὀξύς*, sharp; *ὀδών*, *-όντος*, tooth. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Hydnum setosum* Pers. — SCOPE. Six Iowa representatives were definitely included. — TYPONYM: *Sarcodontia* S. Schulz. (1866).

Persooniana Britz.—See "Polyporaceae."

Phaeodon J. Schroet. *in* Cohn, Krypt.-Fl. Schles. **3** (1) : 458. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: *φαιός*, dusky; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hydnum suaveolens* Scop. ex Fr., but perhaps the earlier selected *Hydnum tomentosum* Schrad. sensu J. Schroet. will have to be maintained. — SCOPE. The genus was divided into three taxa: (i) section *Hydnopsis* J. Schroet., with one species, *Hydnum tomentosum* Schrad. = *Caldesiella ferruginosa* (Fr.) Sacc.; (ii) section *Calodon* (P. Karst.) J. Schroet., of which six species were dealt with; and (iii) section *Sarcodon* (P. Karst.) J. Schroet., with one species, *Hydnum imbricatum* L. ex Fr. — TYPIFICATION. The number of eligible species is three, viz, the types of the three sectional names; they are: (i) *'Hydnum tomentosum'* (only species), (ii) *H. suaveolens*, selected for the basinym *Calodon* P. Karst., q.v., and (iii) *H. imbricatum*, selected for the basinym *Sarcodon* P. Karst., q.v. It is not difficult to defend that a reasonable choice is either species (ii) as the representative of the largest group included, or species (iii) as the one popularly best known and moreover highly esteemed as an edible fungus. I venture to select *H. suaveolens*. — Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 445, 448. 1902) regarded Schroeter's first species, *'Hydnum tomentosum,'* as the type. [At a later date *Phaeodon* sect. *Hydnopsis*, of which it is the only species, was raised to generic rank: *Hydnopsis* (J. Schroet.) Rea, q.v.] — TYPONYMS: *Hydnellum* P. Karst. (1879) and *Calodon* P. Karst. (1881). In case *'Hydnum tomentosum'* were to be maintained as type species: *Odontium* Rafin. (1817; devalidated name), *Caldesiella* Sacc. (1877); *Hydnopsis* (J. Schroet.) Rea (1909), *Odontia* Pers. ex Banker (1929; preoccupied), compare *Phaeodon* J. Schroet. (1888).

Phaeohydnochaete "McGinty": Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **4** (Lett. 61) : 7. 1916; **4** : 561. 1916 (as *Pheaohydnochaete*) (not validly published); see also Stevenson & Cash *in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35 : 73. 1936. — Introduced in connection with *Hydnochaete ferruginea* J. Rick (known to Lloyd from literature only). — For some general remarks on the McGinty names see Part I of the present series (Donk *in* Reinwardtia **1** : 205. 1951).

Phaeoradulum Pat. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **16** : 178. 1900; Essai taxon. Hym. 69. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: *φαιός*, dusky; the genus *Radulum*. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Phaeoradulum guadelupense* Pat.

Phellodon P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9) : 19. 1881; *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6** : 15. 1881.[48]) — ETYMOLOGY: *φελλός*, kork; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hydnum nigrum* Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for *Hydnum* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Lignosa* Fr. group *** Aculeis immutabilis et sporis albidis (Fries, Hym. europ. 605. 1874), although this was not especially stated. Three Finnish species were mentioned, the first being *Hydnum nigrum*. — TYPIFICATION. *Hydnum nigrum* was considered to be the type species by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 444, 448. 1902); Donk (Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. **2** : 46. 1933) selected the same species.

Phlebia Fr.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Phlebiella P. Karst.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Phlebriella.—See *Phlebiella*.

Pleurodon P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9) : 20. 1881; *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6** : 16. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: *πλευρά*, side; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES

[48]) The citation of "Soc. Fauna Fl. Fenn. Med. **5** : 41. 1879" by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 73. 1953) is an error.

(same as of basinym): *Hydnum auriscalpium* L. ex Fr. — Basinym: *Auriscalpium* P. Karst. (1879; typonymous homonym of *Auriscalpium* S. F. Gray, q.v.) — Protonym: *Pleurodon* Quél. *apud* Cooke & Quél., Clav. Hym. 196. 1878 (not validly published).—See under *Calodon*. — Scope. When validly published by Karsten, only one (Finnish) species, *H. auriscalpium*, was mentioned. — Remarks. As already stated under *Calodon*, Karsten replaced *Auriscalpium* P. Karst. by *Pleurodon* Quél. and in doing this he at the same time validly published the latter name. It is accordingly interpreted here as a mere isonym of *Auriscalpium*, and for this reason I regard *H. auriscalpium* as the type species; it was already listed as such by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 76. 1953). — When Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 443, 448. 1902) still ascribed the valid publication of the name to Quélet (1878), he considered Quélet's first species, *Hydnum occidentale* Paul. to be the type.

[*Priapus* Rafin. *in* Medic. Repos., New York, 2nd. Hex., **3** : 423. 1806 (nomen nudum); **5** : 355. 1808 [French translation of description *in* J. Bot. (red. Soc. Bot.), Paris **2** : 176. 1809]. — Type species (only original species): *Priapus niveus* Rafin. — This generic name was listed as a synonym of *Hydnum L.* (*Bidona* Adans.) by Endlicher (Gen. Pl. 39. 1836), evidently by error. The current disposition, as a name given to some species of Phallaceae, is not likely either. Like in the case of *Cerophora* Rafin. I would rather suggest *Lycoperdon* Pers.]

Pseudohydnum J. Rick *in* Ann. mycol. **2** : 409. 1904. — Etymology: *ψευδής*, false; the genus *Hydnum*. Gender: n. — Type species (only original species): *Pseudohydnum guepinioides* J. Rick.—Distributed by J. Rick, Exs. Fung. austro-amer. Fasc. 1 : no. 16. A synonym of *Hydnum thelephorum* Lév. = *Hydnodon thelephorum* (Lév.) Banker. — Valid publication. Descriptio generico-specifica. — Homonym: *Pseudohydnum* P. Karst. (1868; Tremellaceae). — Typonym: *Hydnodon* Banker (1913). — Status. Imprior-able on account of the earlier homonym.

Pycnodon Underw.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Radulochaete J. Rick *in* Ann. mycol. **38** : 58. 1940 — Etymology: the genus *Radulum*; *χαίτη*, hair. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species): *Radulochaete ceracea* J. Rick ("*ceraceum*").

[*Radulum* Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 81. 1825[49]); Elench. **1** : 148. 1828. — Type species (selected): *Radulum aterrimum* Fr. = *Eutypa hydnoidea* (Fr.) Höhn. (Sphaeriales, Pyrenomycetes).

Scope. The original description runs as follows:—

> "*Radulum*. . . . Hymenium interruptum, hinc inde tuberculosum.
>
> "Transitus ad *Thelephoras;* primam speciem proprii generis typum jam censent acutissimi Albertini et Schweinitz. Tubercula elongata, apice saepius sterilia. H.l. *Hydnum pendulum, H. radula (Radulum orbiculare), H. aterrimum, Thelephora hydnoidea* S.M."—Fries (*l.c.*, 1825).

In 1828, when treating it more fully, Fries (*l.c.*) divided the genus into two sections: (i) '*Hydnoidea,*' including *Radulum pendulum* Fr., *R. orbiculare* Fr. (= *Hydnum radula* Fr.), and, with a point of interrogation, *R. molare* (Chaill.) ex Fr., and (ii) '*Genuina,*' including *R. fagineum* ("Pers." ex Fr.) Fr., *R. laetum* Fr., *R. botrytes* Fr., *R. glossoides* (Pers.) ex Fr., and *R. aterrimum* (Fr.) Fr. Another important event in the history of the genus was when Fries (Gen. Hym. 13. 1836) explicitly indicated *R. aterrimum* as the type species of the generic name.

Typification. The clause in the original publication, "primam speciem proprii generis typum jam censent acutissimi Albertini et Schweinitz," at once directs attention to the first of the species mentioned, viz "*Hydnum pendulum.*" One would, of course, not hesitate to identify it with *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. (1821) = *Sistotrema pendulum* A. & S. (Consp. Fung. nisk. 261. 1805), especially if one further realizes that Von Albertini & De Schweinitz, when describing their new fungus, comment upon it as worthy of generic separation. However, there are several factors to mistrust this identification. First, a few years later, *Sistotrema pendulum* was referred by Fries to an other genus, viz. *Irpex* Fr., and that species answers the description of *Irpex* rather better than it does that of *Radulum*. (*Irpex* was proposed at the same time, even on the same page, as *Radulum*!) Secondly, when treating the species of *Radulum* more fully in his subsequent work, Fries included a quite different fungus, but with the same specific epithet, *Radulum pendulum* Fr. This makes the

---

[49]) See also page 362.

quoted passage of the original description with the reference to Von Albertini & De Schweinitz very puzzling—it is probably due to an error. If this solution, to be defended below, would be acceptable, the spotlight on "*Hydnum pendulum*" (whichever species this indication may represent) would be switched off, and that species would become merely the first species. In this connection it may be remembered that in 1828 Fries did not class *Radulum pendulum* (presumably = "*Hydnum pendulum*" of 1825) among '*Genuina*' of *Radulum*, but in the less typical group '*Hydnoidea*.' It was "*Hydnum pendulum*" as identified with *Sistotrema pendulum* A. & S. that was taken as the type species of *Radulum* by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 440. 1902) on the base of the first-species rule. [50])

A second species calls for attention as a candidate for the type. When introducing *Radulum*, Fries coined a generic name calling to mind the specific epithet of *Hydnum radula* which itself was re-christened *Radulum orbiculare*. It was suggested as the type species by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi 346. 1931) and accepted as such by Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 16. 1943]. This species, too, did not belong to the '*Genuina*.'

Finally, any attempt at selecting a type species will have to consider *Hydnum aterrimum*. It is among the original species of 1825; its belongs to '*Genuina*' of 1828; and it was expressly indicated as the type by Fries himself in 1836! Surprisingly enough nobody seems to have followed Fries, the author of the genus.

The list of candidate type species is thus composed of three names: (i) "*Hydnum pendulum*" of 1825, whatever that species may represent, (ii) *Radulum orbiculare*, and (iii) *Hydnum aterrimum*. Before a definite selection be made, it must be settled whether or not "*Hydnum pendulum*" was emphasized by error in the original description. See first under *Irpex*.

With regard to the presence of "*Hydnum pendulum*" in the original publication of *Radulum* three explanations may be taken into consideration:

(a) The clause "primam speciem . . ." as well as the name "*Hydnum pendulum*" were both incorporated by error; they were intended as part of the description of *Irpex* on the same page. This assumption does not satisfactorily account for the existence of *Radulum pendulum*, a different species from *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr., and shortly afterwards described by Fries in *Radulum*. [51])

(b) In 1825 it was indeed Fries's intention to introduce a genus *Radulum* with *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. as type. Shortly afterwards he changed his mind, and in 1828 he transferred that species to *Irpex* at the same time treating it as the type of the latter genus, which, therefore, has been based in 1825 on a different species. With the removal of *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. from *Radulum*, he filled up the gap by describing a new species, *Radulum pendulum* Fr. This supposition has superficially much to recommend itself. However, at closer consideration it is rather easy to dispose of *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. as the type species of *Radulum* 1825, because its teeth are flattened (the reason why Von Albertini & De Schweinitz placed it in *Sistotrema*). Fries would never have included it in *Radulum*, for the generic description of 1825 calls for a hymenium "interruptum, hinc inde tuberculosum"! (He himself already had collected *H. pendulum* A. & S. before 1821!)

(c) When establishing *Radulum*, Fries had his own *R. pendulum* already in hand, at first calling it *Hydnum pendulum*, and had

---

[50]) Banker considered *Radulum* Fr. 1825 based on "*Hydnum pendulum* (= *Sistotrema pendulum* Alb. & Schw.) with three other species," thus indicating the first species as type. He continued:—

> "That the species, simply named as *Hydnum pendulum* by Fries, in this instance is really *Sistotrema pendulum* of Albertini and Schweinitz is made unquestionably evident by a comparison of the text in Systema Orbis Vegetabilis, 81, with the text in the Conspectus Fungorum, 261. Fries himself always cited the Elenchus Fungorum, 149. 1828, as the place where he established the genus. But this must be regarded as a different genus having the same name, for, curiously enough, in the latter work, he describes a totally different species and evidently a new one under the name of pendulum."—Banker (*l.c.*).

See also under *Tylodon*.

[51]) In "Systema orbis vegetabilis" as a rule no new species were described, although quite a number were mentioned. They were to be validly published in Fries's "Elenchus."

decided to incorporate it in that genus. By error, due to the identical epithets of *R. pendulum* and *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr., he inserted the clause "primam speciem . . ." with the description of *Radulum*, instead of with that of *Irpex* (on the same page). A moment of inattention and nothing else. It is this conjecture that seems to be the most acceptable one. It does agree with usage which does not doubt that *Radulum pendulum* was one of the original species of *Radulum*, and *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr. one of them of *Irpex*.

Conclusion. The clause "primam speciem . . ." in the original publication of *Radulum* should be struck out and transferred to the original publication of *Irpex* on the same page. With "*Hydnum pendulum*" the species *Radulum pendulum* Fr. was intended and not *Hydnum pendulum* (A. & S.) ex Fr.

When accepting this conclusion, one is induced to appreciate *Radulum pendulum* merely as one of the species mentioned in the original description and as nothing else, although it is the first one. It was by error unduly emphasized. Thus, the claims for recognition of the three candidate type species of *Radulum* become,

(1) for *Hydnum aterrimum* Fr.: classed in '*Genuina*' in 1828; and indicated in 1836 by Fries himself as the type species;

(2) for *Hydnum radula* Fr.: its specific epithet coincides (slightly modified) with the generic name; it was chosen as the type species in 1931; however, it was not classed in '*Genuina*' in 1828; compare also Fries's remark (Elench. **1** : 148) at the end of the observation to *Radulum:* "Unica tantum species *(R. orbiculare)* aberrans est"!;

(3) for *Sistotrema pendulum* A. & S.: regarded as type in 1902; but excluded by Fries himself in 1828; and it must be doubted whether it was really ever included among the original species of 1825. (The fact that, if mentioned at all, it was the first species, has not much weight under the present Code.)

When we consider it proven that in 1825 none of the species was singled out as type by *original* designation, one is, I believe, bound to select *H. aterrimum*, since it was the first species to be indicated as the type, and by the author of the genus himself at that.

Homonym. *Radula* Dum. (1822; Hepaticae) is not to be regarded as an earlier homonym. — Isonym. Compare *Tylodon* Banker. — Status. *Radulum* is priorable, and seems to be the correct name for the ascomycetous genus now called *Eutypa* Tul., or, rather, for the monotypic segregate of the latter genus, *Xenotypa* Petrak (*in* Sydowia **9** : 497-500. 1955).]

Ricnophora Pers.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Sarcodon P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9) : 20. 1881; *in* Medd. Soc. Faun. Fl. fenn. **6** : 16. 1881. — Etymology: *σάρξ, σαρκός* flesh; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum imbricatum* L. ex Fr. — Protonym: *Sarcodon* Quél. *apud* Cooke & Quél., Clav. Hym. 195. 1878 (not validly published).—See under *Calodon*. Quélet included both *Hydnum repandum* L. ex Fr. and *H. imbricatum* among the fleshy, stipitate species for which he introduced this name. — Scope. When Karsten took up the name and validly published it, he excluded the *Hydnum repandum* group. — Typification. The undisputed selected type species is *Hydnum imbricatum*, indicated by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 442, 448. 1902; for *Sarcodon* Quél. 1878) and accepted by subsequent authors, Banker (*in* Mem. Torrey bot. Cl. **12** : 103. 1906) and Donk (Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. **2** : 59. 1933), for the name as re-published by Karsten.

Sarcodontia S. Schulz. *in* S. Schulz., Kanitz, & Knapp *in* Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien **16** (Abhandl.): 41. 1866. — Etymology: *σάρξ, σαρκός*, meat; the genus *Odontia*. Gender: f. —Type species (only original species): *Sarcodontia mali* S. Schulz.—Later on Schulzer von Müggenburg [*in* Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien **24** (Abhandl.): 293. 1874] described this species more fully under the name of "*Kneiffia setigera* Fr. *β pomicola* Schulzer, olim *Sarcodontia Mali* mihi." Accepting this redescription as applying to the same species on which the genus was based, the type of *Sarcodontia* represents *Hydnum setosum* Pers.; compare Donk (*in* Mycologia **44** : 262-263. 1952). — Valid publication. As follows:

> "*Sarcodontia* Schulzer, *Kneiffia* Fr. Form b. Stroma d i c k, f l e i s c h i g formlos, auf der ganzen Oberfläche mit ungleichförmigen Zacken besetzt. Gehört weder habituell noch der Substanz nach zu den Telephorei, sondern hieher [Hydnei?].
>
> "295. *S. Mali.* Vinkovce an kranken (veredelten) Aepfeln."—S. Schulzer (*l.c.*).

Typonym: *Oxydontia* L. W. Miller (1933).

Sclerodon P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48** : 348, 360. 1889. — Etymology: *σκληρός*, tough; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (same as of basinym; only species of isonym): *Hydnum strigosum* Sw. ex Fr. — Basinym: *Gloiodon* P. Karst. (1879), q.v.—*Sclerodon* is here regarded as a mere name change. — Valid publication. There is a reference to *Gloidon* P. Karst. (p. 360) and a description as part of a key will be found on page 348. The only species treated is the selected type of *Gloiodon*. — Remark. Karsten's reasons for coining a new name were not made clear. — Typonym: *Leaia* Banker (1906).

Scopuloides (Mass.) Höhn. & L.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Sistotrema Pers.—See "Polyporaceae."

Sistotrema Fr.—See "Polyporaceae."

Sistotrema S. F. Gray.—See "Polyporaceae."

Somion Adans.—See "Polyporaceae."

Spathulina Pat.—See "Polyporaceae."

Steccherinum S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1** : 597 ("*Stecherina*"), 651. 1821. — Etymology: steccherino, an Italian word derived from stecco, thorn. Gender: n. — Type species (selected): *Hydnum ochraceum* Pers. — Scope. Introduced with three species: (i) *Hydnum ochraceum*, (ii) *H. gelatinosum* Jacq. = *Tremellodon gelatinosum* (Jacq. ex Fr.) Fr., and (iii) *Steccherinum quercinum* S. F. Gray = *Hydnum erinaceus* Bull. = *Hericium erinaceus* (Bull. ex Fr.) Pers. — Typification. The first species has been considered to be the type; it was indicated as such by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 448. 1902; *in* Mem. Torrey bot. Cl. **12** : 124. 1912; *in* Mycologia **4** : 309. 1912) and accepted by Miller (*in* Mycologia **25** : 297. 1933), by Miller & Boyle [*in* Stud. nat. Hist. Univ. Iowa **18** (2) : 45. 1943], and Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18** : 100. 1949). — Remark. Gray cited "Mich." as the author of the name. One will find 'steccherino' mentioned as part of vernacular, Italian denominations (not as scientific ones!) under eight (out of ten) of Micheli's species of *Erinaceus* Dill. (Micheli, Nova Pl. Gen. 132-133. 1729); none of them represents a species included by Gray under his *Steccherinum* — Variant spelling: "*Stecherina*": S. F. Gray, *op. cit.* p. 597.—Used in a key and apparently an error. — Typonym: *Leptodon* Quél. (1886; preoccupied) and *Mycoleptodon* Pat. (1900).

Stecherina.—See *Steccherinum*.

Thelephora Ehrh. ex Fr.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Thwaitesiella Mass.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Tylodon Banker *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 440. 1902 (nomen nudum?). — Type species (by original designation): "*Radulum pendulum* Fries, Elenchus Fungorum, 149. 1828; not *Radulum pendulum* Fries, Syst. Orb. Veg. 81. 1825" [52]) = *Tylodon friesii* Banker. —This is conspecific with *Corticium subcostatum* (P. Karst.) Bourd. & G. — Banker (see also *op. cit.* p. 448) introduced this name for "*Radulum* Fr. 1830," by which indication is meant the name as it appears in Fries's "Elenchus Fungorum," 1828. As discussed under *Irpex* and *Radulum*, Banker considered *Radulum* Fr. 1825 as based on *Sistotrema pendulum* A. & S. "Fries himself always cites the Elenchus Fungorum, 149. 1828, as the place where he established the genus. But this must be regarded as a different genus having the same name, for, curiously enough, in the latter work, he describes a totally different [first!] species and evidently a new one under the name of *pendulum*." — *Radulum pendulum* Fr. 1828, the species which Banker has designated as the type of his new name *Tylodon*, can neither be accepted as the type of *Radulum* Fr. 1825, q.v., nor of Fries's application of 1828 of that generic name. This latter use does, emphatically, not represent a new but homonymous name; moreover, it has a different type species from *Tylodon*. In my opinion, Banker's reference to the generic description is not valid, and, therefore, must be deleted, as it is to a description based on a different type from the one he designated for his new name. This conclusion may appear not generally acceptable; it is here given for further consideration.

Tyrodon P. Karst. in Rev. mycol. **3** (No. 9): 19. 1881; *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6** : 15. 1881. — Etymology: *τυρός*, cheese; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m. — Type species (only original species [53]): *Hydnum repandum* L. ex

---

[52]) See for this species under *Irpex*.

[53]) Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 444. 1902) stated that "the genus was founded on *Hydnum repandum* L. and *H. rufescens* Pers." This is not correct: in the "Revue mycologique" one finds mentioned "*T. repandus* (Linn.) . . .—F. *rufescens*

Fr. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Tyroden*": *in* Rev. mycol. **5** : 127. 1883.—An error of printing. —TYPONYMS: *Erinaceus* Dill. (1719; pre-Linnean), *Bidona* Adans. (1763; devalidated name), *Echinus* Haller (1768; devalidated name), *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. (1821), *Dentinum* S. F. Gray (1821), and *Hypothele* Paul. ex Banker (1904; not validly published).

Tuberculinia Velen., České Houby 734. 1922 (nomen provisorium). — In an observation to the description of *Grandinia ceracea* Velen., the author remarked: "Probaliter fungus hic genus proprium repraesentat (*Tuberculinia* Vel.), quod a *Grandiniis* carposomate ceraceo-carnoso, superficie haud levi et mycelio mucedineo, arachnoideo discrepat."—Translation from the Czech by Pilát (Velen. Sp. nov. Bas. 269. 1948). — Not *Tuberculina* Sacc. (1880; n.v.; Moniales, Deuteromycetes).

Vararia P. Karst.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Xylodon (Pers.) *ex* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1** : 649. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: *ξύλον*, wood; *ὀδών*, tooth. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Sistotrema quercinum* (Pers.) Pers.

The question, which species Persoon called *Odontia quercina* Pers. (Obs. mycol. **2** : 17. 1799), is of importance because its answer determines the application of the generic name *Xylodon* (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray, of which it is the (selected) type species. I have long hesitated before making up my mind and I am not quite satisfied with the conclusion reached below, although I shall act in accordance with it.

> Persoon's fungus must be, one may assume from the start, one of three species, all excellently described by Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 403-405. 1928), viz, (i) *Radulum membranaceum* (Bull. sensu Bres.) Bres = *R. molare* (Chaill.) ex Fr. (not *Sistotrema molariforme* Pers., which is *R. radula*); (ii) *Radulum orbiculare* Fr. = *R. radula* (Fr.) Nannf.; and (iii) "*Radulum quercinum* Fr., Hym. p. 623" = *R. quercinum* (Fr., non Pers.) Fr. sensu Bres. In the next lines these species will be indicated as *R. molare*, *R. radula*, and *R. quercinum* respectively.[54]) That great caution is required in distinguishing between these species without microscopical examination of the spores, will become apparent from the note attached by Bourdot & Galzin to their generic description, and to which the reader is referred.

I searched in vain in Persoon's herbarium for a specimen that could be interpreted as the type of *Odontia quercina*. There are three specimens left which Persoon brought into relation with it, but none was definitely attributed to it. One is labelled "*Sistotrema quercinum* ? *Hydnum membranaceum* Bull." (L 910.270-474). Bourdot wrote about it to me: "*Radulum membranaceum* sensu Bres. [*R. molare*]. J'ai trouvé une partie d'hyménium très nette, avec assez nombreuses spores. — Hyphes 3—4 μ avec boucles très rares; basides 40—45 (—50?) x 7,5—9 μ; spores (7,5—) 10—11 x (5—) 6—7,5 μ."

The second specimen is labelled "*Sistotrema quercina* ?" (L 910.270-470). I did not venture to identify it, and neither did Bourdot: "Pour moi indéterminé. Pas de spores; basides paraissent plus étroites que dans *Radulum membranaceum* Bres. [*R. molare*]. Hyphes plus fines 1—3 μ; beaucoup d'oxalate. Ces caractères indiqueraient plutôt *R. orbiculare* [*R. radula*] que *R. membranaceum* Bres. ou *quercinum* Bres. [*R quercinum*]. Mais ?"

The label of the third specimen reads, "*Hydnum membranaceum* Bull.? *Sistotrema quercinum* Syn. fung. 552 *Hydnum heteromallum*. Gallia" (L 910.270-692). The country indicates that this is not the type, for *Odontia quercina* was described when Persoon lived in Germany; this conclusion is supported by the fact that Persoon was inclined to consider it a distinct species ("*Hydnum heteromallum*"). This collection I determined as

---

(Pers.) . . ., "the 'F.' apparently standing for 'T.' = *Tyrodon* rather than for 'forma,' but in any case the second name is not preceded by the number 2, which indicates that only one species was included. In Karsten's other publication of 1881 *T. rufescens* is marked with an asterisk, denoting a subspecies. For a comparable case, see *Dryodon*.

[54]) The generic name *Radulum*, q.v., is untenable for a taxon of Hymenomycetes because the type species is an ascomycete (*Hydnum aterrimum* Fr.) and the genus a heterogeneous assortment of not closely related species to be distributed over several genera.

"voisin de *Hydnum argutum* [sensu] Bres." and Bourdot was of the same opinion, "Je crois aussi *Odontia arguta* sensu Bres." Thus, the consultation of Persoon's herbarium did not yield any definite result.

When Fries (Syst. mycol. **1** : 423. 1821) re-published *Odontia quercina* (= *Sistotrema quercinum*) as *Hydnum quercinum*, he gave a description based on his own collections. It is now generally assumed that he dealt with a different species, which is now interpreted according to Bresadola (*in* Atti Accad. Agiati III **3** : 103. 1897): for a description, see Bourdot & Galzin (*l.c.*).

The prevailing opinion during the last half century seems to have been hat Persoon's fungus is identical with *R. molare*. For instance, what Lloyd [Mycol. Writ. **5** (Rad.): 6 *fs. 970-972.* 1917] called, and illustrated as, '*Radulum quercinum*' of Persoon certainly is this species. Bourdot & Galzin (*op. cit.*, index, p. 744) identified the Persoonian plant in the same way (as *R. membranaceum*). A careful reading of the original description calls to mind rather *R. molare*, and to a less degree *R. radula* but hardly *R. quercinum*, with which Fries confused it (at least from 1838 onwards). It is of interest to find that Persoon's labels prove that he never associated specimens of the latter two species (which he described under several names) with his *Odontia quercina*. My conclusion is that for all practical purposes we are entitled to identify *O. quercina* with *R. molare*.

DEVALIDATED BASINYM: *Sistotrema* sect. "*** Resupinata effusa, dentibus difformibus subincisis (*Xylodon*)" Pers., Syn. Fung. 552. 1801.—Persoon included six species (and one doubtfully referred here), in this order: *Sistotrema quercinum*, *S. fagineum* Pers., *S. cerasi* (Pers.) Pers., *S. digitatum* Pers. (basinym, *Hydnum paradoxum* Schrad.), *S. spathulatum* (Schrad.) Pers., and *S. cellare* Pers. Of these the first may well be regarded as the type species because of the observation added to it when Persoon described it for the first time as *Odontia quercina* Pers. (Obs. mycol. **2** : 17. 1799); in this observation Persoon envisaged for this species and *Odontia cerasi* Pers. a new group which he considered intermediate between *Poria* Pers. and *Odontia* Pers., a group for which he did not yet propose a name, but which he would rather include in *Sistotrema* Pers. — SCOPE. Gray, who acknowledged Persoon's authorship, was the first to raise Persoon's section to generic rank. His species are *S. quercinum* and *S. digitatum*, this low number being due to the fact that he had no other species to report from the British Isles. The circumscription of the taxon remained unaltered. — TYPIFICATION. Both species of Gray are among Persoon's original set, and this makes it possible to select Persoon's leading species as the type, too, of the generic name. This species, Gray's first one, was already indicated as such by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29** : 439, 448. 1902). — REMARK. In my opinion the type species of *Odontia* S. F. Gray and *Xylodon* (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray belong to the same genus, at least if they are to be identified with *Radulum quercinum* (Fr.) Fr. and *R. molare* (Chaill.) ex Fr. respectively, as I assume that they ought to be. Because the two generic names were simultaneously published, I herewith reduce *Xylodon* to the synonymy of *Odontia* in an attempt to retain the latter name. — MONADELPHOUS HOMONYM (i) *Xylodon* (Pers.) *ex* Chev., Fl. gén. Env. Paris **1** : 272. 1826.[56])—This is Persoon's section for the second time, and independently of Gray, raised to generic rank. Chevallier somewhat altered the limits to accommodate the resupinate members of *Hydnum* L. ex Fr. as it appeared in Fries's "Systema." Some of Persoon's original species were excluded and a few resupinate members of *Hydnum* added to the original Persoonian group which re-appeared as "*Xylodon* **a. Aculeis compressis, albis." This group contained, e.g. *Sistotrema fagineum*, *S. quercinum*, selected type species of *Xylodon* (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray, and *Hydnum paradoxum* Schrad. ex Fr. (*S. digitatum*). Chevallier's first species is a true mixtum compositum (*Hydnum membranaceum* "Bull." ex Fr.). Chevallier's name may be accepted as having the same type as *Xylodon* (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray, which makes it a typonymous homonym. — (ii) *Xylodon* "Ehrenb." ex P. Karst. *in* Acta Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **2** (1) : 31. 1881.—When Karsten introduced this name in 1881 he mentioned two examples: *Irpex paradoxus* (Schrad. ex Fr.) Fr. (first species) and *Irpex*

[56]) When still ascribing the generic name *Xylodon* to Chevallier instead of S. F. Gray, I had selected a different species (not mentioned by name) from the one mentioned above for Gray's name. This remark to explain foot-note 60 in a previous publication (Donk *in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17** : 192. 1941).

obliquus (Schrad. ex Fr.) Fr. The former species is the one for which Persoon coined a new name (*Sistotrema digitatum*); it is now often interpreted as a mere form of *Poria versiporus* (Pers.) Romell. It may be pointed out that in the next year Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37** : 65. 1882) treated the genus more fully and included, besides the two original species already mentioned, also *Sistotrema candidum* Ehrenb., *Irpex spathulatus* (Schrad. ex Fr.) Fr., and *Irpex deformis* Fr. (*Hydnum pseudo-boletus* DC. ex Fr., Syst. mycol. **1** : 424. 1821). Karsten ascribed the name *Xylodon* to Ehrenberg (Sylv. mycol. berol. 33. 1818). That author never founded a genus of that name; he merely used *"Xylodon"* as a subdivisional epithet under *Sistotrema*, preceding the descriptions of three species (*Sistotrema carneum* Ehrenb., *S. fuscoviolaceum* Ehrenb., and *S. candidum* Ehrenb.). Although Ehrenberg did not refer to Persoon, there is no room for doubt that he applied Persoon's sectional epithet. The first author to list a name "*Xylodon* Ehrenb." was Endlicher (Gen. Pl. 39. 1836; Ench. bot. 21. 1841), who gave it as a synonym of *Irpex* Fr. Karsten's two species of 1881 do not correspond with any of Ehrenberg's, but one of his species is among Persoon's original lot. W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 100. 1953) listed *Irpex paradoxus* as the type species of *Xylodon* "Ehr. ex Karst." — "*Xylodon* Ehrenb. 1818 Sylv. myc. Berol. 30; . . ." was taken up by O. Kuntze [Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2) : 540. 1898] as the correct name for *Irpex* Fr. As already pointed out, Kuntze's statement that Persoon's sectional name was raised to generic status by Ehrenberg, is not correct; neither is his statement that Ehrenberg did so "mit der Art: *Xylodon candidus* Ehrb." It is clear that this species was implicitly regarded as the type of *Xylodon* "Ehrb." by Kuntze. — Bondarzew & Singer (*in* Ann. mycol. **39** : 49. 1941; *apud* Singer *in* Mycologia **36** : 66. 1944) took *Irpex paradoxus* as the type of *Xylodon* "Karst."